

The Solicitors Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 24, 1886.

CURRENT TOPICS.

UNDER THE Rules of the Supreme Court, the offices of the courts are closed between the 22nd and the 28th of this month, being the only instance during the whole year of all the offices being closed for five consecutive days.

EARLY IN 1874 the first brick of the building of the Royal Courts of Justice was laid, and on the 4th of December, 1882, the building was opened. Already, in 1886, the accommodation provided is found to be too limited, and the vacant space on the west side of the building is, "at no distant time," to be utilized for the purpose of its extension. When Mr. AYTON cut down the original estimate, and reduced the space provided, it was generally anticipated that more courts and more offices would be ultimately required, and the space now vacant was pointed to as the available site, but it was scarcely contemplated that its speedy appropriation for that purpose would be announced within four years from the time of occupation.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT made by the Attorney-General on Monday in the House of Commons that the Lord Chancellor contemplates an alteration of the existing Rules of Court by removing the restrictions which limit the facilities for trial in Lancashire will give satisfaction to suitors residing in that county, and the fact that the judges have assented to the plan will remove all difficulty in carrying out the proposed arrangements. The alterations contemplated appear, from the remarks of the Attorney-General, to include a scheme by which the administrative business in causes proceeding in the district registries of Manchester and Liverpool will be "prosecuted locally, and not necessarily in London." The advantage of keeping all the documents and records of an action in one place is specially important, as a search may be practically abortive by reason of the particular record wanted being in an office several hundred miles distant from the searcher.

IT DOES NOT very clearly appear from the print of the "Irish Government Bill" whether the question of the continuance of the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords is to be left to the discretion of the Irish Legislature. It is provided by clause 36 that "nothing in this Act shall affect the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords in respect of actions and suits in Ireland"; and clause 39 provides that the Act, except such provisions thereof as are declared to be alterable by the Legislature of Ireland, shall not be altered except in the manner thereby specified; but it does not seem that the maintenance of the appellate jurisdiction is a provision of the Act; the only stipulation is that the Act shall not affect it; and it would seem that the general power proposed to be conferred on the Irish legislative body, "to alter and repeal any law in Ireland," would extend to the abolition of the right of appeal to the House of Lords, except as regards appeals in revenue cases from the decision of the Exchequer Division of the Irish High Court of Justice, which, by clause 20, are to go direct to the House of Lords. This division is to be constituted "a court of exchequer for revenue purposes" under the Act; its judges are to be appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant and the English Chancellor, and are to be removable only on an address from the Imperial Parliament; and the rules relating to procedure in revenue cases are not to be altered except with the approval of the English Chancellor.

THE THIRD HEARING by the Court of Appeal of the now famous case of *Ex parte Stanford, Re Barber* has ended in the confirmation of the view taken on the second hearing, but the judgments proceeded on a new ground. It will be remembered that the reason for the previous decision that the bill of sale was rendered invalid by the insertion of the words "as beneficial owner," was that the intention of section 9 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, was to provide a simple form of security which would enable every grantor of a bill of sale to understand his position and liability. All the judges now (except, perhaps, FRY, L.J.) appear to abandon this ground, and lay down the rule that, "whatever form the bill of sale takes, the form adopted must, in order to be valid, produce not merely the like effect, but the same effect—that is to say, the legal effect, the whole legal effect, and nothing but the legal effect—which it would produce if cast in the exact mould of the schedule." That is undoubtedly a reasonable rule, but did the bill of sale in the recent case infringe it? It did, says the court, because one of the covenants implied by the use of the words "as beneficial owner" gives the grantee, on default being made, "an immediate power of entry, and, impliedly, a power of removing forthwith the property conveyed"; the importation of such a covenant into a bill of sale produces a legal effect beyond that of the scheduled form, which, when read with section 13, does not give the grantee the power of immediate removal until five days shall have elapsed. But would not the express provision of section 13 render the implied power of immediate removal absolutely inoperative? If so, there would seem to be nothing in the implied covenants to alter the legal effect of the scheduled form.

IN COMMENTING on the decision in *Re Hickley & Steward* (29 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 213), we pointed out that that case did not settle the question of the remuneration to which a solicitor is entitled who, after the commencement of the Remuneration Order, prepares an agreement for a lease, and subsequently a lease in pursuance of the agreement; and we added that, according to the general practice, solicitors have in such cases charged for the agreement according to the old system, as altered by Schedule 2, and for the lease according to the scale in Sched. 1, Part II. This practice, we believe, was originally based on an opinion given by Mr. WOLSTENHOLME on a case submitted by the council of the Incorporated Law Society in 1883, and it has been recognized in opinions subsequently given by the council. We report, however, this week a decision by Mr. Justice PEARSON in *Re Emanuel & Simmonds*, which completely upsets this general practice. The learned judge holds that the preparation of an agreement for a lease is part of the "business connected with a lease," and is therefore, according to *Re Field* (29 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 438, L. R. 29 Ch. D. 608), covered by the scale fee for the lease. We do not hesitate to say that this is a very astonishing decision, whether looked at with regard to its practical consequences or to the wording of the Remuneration Order. As regards the latter, it will be remembered that the scale fee is expressly given (Sched. 1, Part II.) "for preparing, settling, and completing *leases and counterpart*." If we turn to the scale in Sched. 1, Part I., we find that the words "including perusal and completion of contract" are expressly added to the corresponding item for "preparing and completing conveyance." Can anyone doubt that if the framers of the order had intended that an agreement for a lease should be covered by the scale fee for "preparing, settling, and completing lease," they would have added similar words in Sched. 1, Part II? If the learned judge's view that the words of rule 2 of the order—"the remuneration of a solicitor in respect of business connected with *sales, purchases, leases, &c.*"—include written contracts is correct, why did the framers of the order expressly provide that purchase contracts should be included in the scale fee? The learned judge seems to have thought that

he was bound by the decision in *Re Field*; but, with much deference, we venture to think that it is clearly distinguishable. That case was decided on the introductory words of rule 2 of the order; and the interviews and letters for which it was sought to charge were no doubt fairly "business connected with leases" within the words of the rule. But the learned judge seems to have over-looked the fact that the first part of rule 2 carefully distinguishes between "business" and "matters of conveyancing"; and we venture to think that the preparation of an agreement for a lease is undoubtedly a matter of conveyancing, and not "business connected with" a lease; and since there is no scale fee provided for an agreement for a lease not operating as a demise, it ought to be paid for on the old system, as altered by Schedule 2.

IN MANY RESPECTS Mr. CLARKE's defence in the *Bartlett* case deserves the plaudits it has received. He had certainly a difficult line to take, and he took it with great skill. The theory of the prosecution was that the chloroform was administered by the prisoner while the deceased was in a state of insensibility. The motive alleged by the prosecution was the desire of the prisoner to get rid of a husband for whom she had ceased to care, and to pave the way for a marriage to DYSON. The evidence that the deceased died from chloroform administered internally was conclusive; so also was the evidence as to the relations between the husband and wife and between them and DYSON. A line of defence must be adopted compatible with these facts, and the line adopted was, first, to show that it was practically impossible to administer chloroform internally to a person in a state of insensibility; and as to this the cross-examination of the medical witnesses, and the marshalling of their testimony in the forefront of the address to the jury were masterly. The theory as to the mode of administration set up by the prosecution was demolished; then the question arose how was the motive alleged to be disposed of? This was done by emphasizing the evidence as to Mrs. BARTLETT's unusual devotion as a nurse to her husband; by laying stress on the absence of a particle of evidence of unfaithfulness on her part to her husband; and by pointing out that her conduct after his death was perfectly natural and consistent with grief at the loss of her husband; all this was admirably in point, and was brought out with great force. But now came the question how was the death occasioned? Here we think that, with all his skill, the advocate went a little astray. The course he took was to admit and insist on the evidence relating to Mr. BARTLETT's affection for DYSON and approval of his wife's relations with him; with the view, apparently, of suggesting the theory of a suicide committed by the husband in order to remove the obstacle which existed to the marriage of Mrs. BARTLETT to DYSON. Put in this bald way the theory does not seem likely to attract the regard of a jury; it is, of course, needless to say that Mr. CLARKE did not by any means present it in this way; nevertheless, we must confess that we regard with some surprise both the suggestion of such a theory, and the fact that it was left to the judge to draw attention to the simpler and more reasonable supposition that the deceased took the chloroform in order to relieve his sleeplessness.

THE CONVEYANCER has always this consolatory thought, that, while other men's works are forgotten, his compositions live. Whether they benefit or perplex succeeding generations is comparatively immaterial: in any event, they provide work for a deserving class. Their circulation is limited, but this is compensated for by the care which is taken of them, and by the lengthened period during which they retain their interest. Few members of the fraternity can have left behind them more enduring memorials in muniment rooms than the late Mr. J. L. TATHAM, who died on the 16th inst., after having for nearly half a century enjoyed an extensive practice as a conveyancer. Many of our readers can testify to valuable assistance derived from his learning and skill, and not a few will recall the kindness shewn by him to those who had been his pupils. On his retirement, two years ago, he was entertained at a complimentary dinner given by about forty of his former pupils, Lord Justice LINDLEY being in the chair. At the time when he retired the list of his former pupils then living included three of

her Majesty's Judges, the Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, one of the Railway Commissioners, and three County Court Judges. Mr. TATHAM was born in 1806, was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in 1834, was elected a bencher of that society in 1866, and served as treasurer in 1873.

IT IS VERY MUCH to be regretted that the verdict of the jury in the *Bartlett* case should have been accompanied by a qualifying remark, and that the foreman of the jury should afterwards have published a statement shewing the number of voices on each side before the verdict was given. The qualified verdict first given was, of course, no verdict at all, and could not have been received as such; nor was it so received, the simple "Not Guilty" having been subsequently extracted from the jury. If the jury had persisted in the qualified verdict, they would have been sent back to reconsider the case. In order to avoid the mishap of a qualified verdict occurring again, the instructions to the jury bailiff, "You shall not suffer any man to speak to them, nor shall you speak to them yourself except to ask them whether they are agreed upon their verdict," might, perhaps, be usefully expanded by words to the effect that "You shall instruct them to give no verdict except 'Guilty' or 'Not Guilty' without leave of the court."

LIBEL BY A HUSBAND ON HIS WIFE.

AN important decision was given on the 5th inst., in the Divisional Court, in the case of *Reg. v. The Lord Mayor and Vance*, upon the law affecting the relations of husband and wife. The question involved in the case was whether a wife can take criminal proceedings against her husband for a libel, when the libel affects her in her credit and reputation and inflicts an injury upon her in carrying on a separate trade or occupation. The complainant, who was living separate from her husband, was earning her livelihood as a vocalist; and it may be taken for the purposes of the case that the libel was calculated to injure her in her occupation, by imputing to her that she had lived with her husband as his mistress, and was not, as she was representing, his wife. The question arose upon a rule against the Lord Mayor and the husband of the complainant to show cause why a summons should not issue for a defamatory libel, and the learned judges (Mathew and A. L. Smith, JJ.) discharged the rule upon two grounds—(1) that a wife cannot, by the law of England, notwithstanding the Married Women's Property Acts, 1882 and 1884, give evidence against her husband in criminal proceedings of this nature, and that, as the only evidence in support of the summons was the evidence of the complainant, the proceeding must necessarily fail; and (2) that a criminal proceeding for libel, even though the libel affects her credit and reputation and injures her in her separate trade or occupation, is not a proceeding for "the protection and security" of the "separate property" of a married woman such as the Act of 1882 authorizes a wife to take against her husband. The "fair fame" of the applicant was not, according to the ruling of the learned judges, her separate property.

We venture to question the correctness of this judgment. As to the question of evidence, we do not see how it is possible to consider the first point separately from the second. Either the proceeding was a "remedy and redress, by way of criminal proceedings, for the protection and security" of the separate property of a married woman, within section 12 of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, or it was not. If it was, that section and also the Act of 1884 expressly authorize a husband and wife to give evidence against each other. If it was not, then the whole proceeding fails, evidence or no evidence, for the Act of 1882 only authorizes it under those conditions.

The second point is one of some interest, and involves the important question, What is meant by the words "separate property"? If they are to have a limited technical meaning assigned to them, such as was given to the words "separate estate" when those words first came to be used, the scope and operation of the Act will be seriously curtailed. The Act of 1870 contained a similar expression, "for the protection and security of property," though

the terms of the section (section 11) were less wide than those of the later Act. In the case of *Moore v. Robinson* (48 L. J. Q. B. 156) Lush, J., appears to have been inclined to give the words a liberal interpretation, and such, we should submit, is the correct view. A married woman may carry on a separate trade; the goodwill of a business, though it has no tangible existence, has been held by Kay, J., in *Re Dearmer, James v. Dearmer* (50 L. T. 905, at p. 907), to be part of her separate property. It could hardly be otherwise. If a woman carrying on a trade marries, the goodwill of her business would surely no more pass to her husband than any other separate property belonging to her. A defamatory libel upon her character, or "fair fame," may seriously injure the goodwill of the business, and to protect her credit and reputation may be essential to the protection of the goodwill—i.e., to the protection of her separate property. Suppose a married woman earned her livelihood by carrying on a school, or keeping an institution for training young persons as governesses, and libellous attacks were circulated upon her moral character, how could it be said that the goodwill of her business was not injured, and that a proceeding for libel was not necessary to protect it? To protect her earnings, but leave her at the mercy of anyone who chose to deprive her of the chance of winning them, seems to us to be somewhat "frittering away the law."

It should be noticed that the learned judges declined to express any opinion as to whether a civil action for libel could be taken by a wife against her husband under similar circumstances. The present Master of the Rolls suggested, in the case of *Summers v. City Bank* (L. R. 9 C. P. 580, 584), that it would be a proceeding for the protection and security of her separate property within the Act of 1870; and, from the observations at the close of the judgment in *Moore v. Robinson* (*ubi supra*), Lush, J., appears to have thought that a married woman could, under the same Act, sue her husband for libel, if the libel were connected with property. The judges however, in the case we are discussing, considered that criminal proceedings for libel could not come within that description, because the reason why a libel is an indictable offence is that it tends to a breach of the peace. We do not understand this reasoning. The tendency to a breach of the peace is no doubt the circumstance or ingredient which makes a libel an offence against the State, and not merely a private injury. Forgery, or a malicious injury to property, is, for some other good reason, an offence against the State; and so in the case of any other indictable offence. If this reasoning is correct, no criminal proceeding can, so far as we can see, be a proceeding for the protection of the property of an individual, since the primary object of every criminal prosecution is to redress the public wrong, and not to protect the private right. But the Legislature has expressly enacted, in the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, that a wife shall have the same remedies and redress, by way of criminal proceedings, for the protection and security of her own separate property, as if she were unmarried. The Act of 1884 (relating to evidence) was passed wholly with a view to such proceedings. We would venture to submit that, though criminal proceedings are primarily for the protection of society and the redress of the public wrong, yet they incidentally result in the greater protection and security of property; that to deprive a person of the power of taking them would be to expose his property to greater peril and insecurity than that of his neighbours; and that the Legislature intended, by these words, to give to married women the same complete security for their separate property, even as against their husbands, as any other person possesses, whether that security be the direct or indirect, primary or incidental, consequence of the ability to prosecute for a criminal and malicious wrong done to their separate property. A person with no property to lose may treat the liability to an action with indifference; it may require the criminal law to be put in force to afford an adequate protection against his malice.

On Monday, in the House of Commons, Mr. T. Bolton asked the hon. member for North-West Staffordshire whether he would consider the propriety of laying out the vacant land on the west side of the Royal Courts of Justice as an ornamental garden for the use of the public. Mr. Leveson-Gower said it is not proposed to lay out as a public recreation ground the land in question, which will be required at no distant time for the extension of the Courts of Justice. A Departmental Committee has recently reported in this sense.

THE CROWN OFFICE RULES, 1886.

II.

RULES regulating the procedure on the prerogative writ of *mandamus* were inserted in the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883. They formed part 2 of order LIII., and are now repealed by rule 307. The rules substituted in their place are, for the most part, a mere reproduction of such rules, with some few additions and amendments, and do not materially alter the practice as then provided. The application for the writ must, as under the former practice, be made to a divisional court of the Queen's Bench Division for an order *nisi*, except where it is to proceed to the election of a corporate officer, in which case the application is regulated by section 225 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and must be made on notice of motion. Before the Judicature Acts the writ was never granted except by order of the court in term time, so that, however pressing a case might be arising in vacation, it could not be dealt with until the court sat again in the next following term. Since the Judicature Acts came into operation the vacation judges have, in some few urgent cases, entertained applications in the Long Vacation, but, in order to do so, they have constituted themselves into a divisional court. It is, however, very questionable whether a single judge in vacation can form a divisional court, in view of section 17 of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, which requires divisional courts to be constituted of two judges, notwithstanding that R. S. C., 1883, LXIII., 12, provides that the vacation judges may sit either separately or together as a divisional court. Under the new practice jurisdiction is given to a judge in vacation, upon its being shewn to his satisfaction that the matter is urgent, to dispose of the application upon a summons at chambers. After a return has been made to the first writ of *mandamus*, the subsequent pleadings and proceedings are to be the same as in an action (rule 136), the return being treated for such purpose as though it were a statement of defence. The limit of time for moving for costs when the *mandamus* has been obeyed has been altered from "within two terms of obeying the writ," under the old practice, to "before the fifth day of the sittings next after that in which the right to make such application accrued" (rule 77).

Prohibition is disposed of in three rules (81, 82, and 137). The application in criminal proceedings must be to a divisional court for an order *nisi*, but in civil proceedings it may be made either in that manner or by summons before a judge at chambers. The order may, under special circumstances, be absolute in the first instance, and if pleadings be ordered, the proceedings are then to be the same as in an action.

Considerable changes are effected with regard to the proceeding by information in the nature of a *quo warranto*, which is the remedy against a person who usurps any public office or franchise. It is in form a criminal proceeding, and a defendant upon conviction is, or it may be more correct to say was, liable to be punished by fine for the usurpation, as well as being ousted from the office. For a great many years it has been used only for the purpose of trying the civil right, and section 15 of the Judicature Act, 1884, directs that it shall be deemed a civil proceeding whether for the purposes of appeal or otherwise. And although the form of the information (see Forms Nos. 32 and 33) remains unaltered, the pleadings and all subsequent proceedings are entirely changed, and assimilated by rule 134 to the pleadings and subsequent proceedings in an action, the information being treated as though it were a statement of claim. No alteration is effected by the rules with regard to the application for leave to file the information. It must be made *ex parte* in the first instance for an order *nisi* (rule 51), except in cases falling within the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, which are provided for by section 225 of that Act, and are required to be made upon notice of motion. The only other change worth mentioning is with reference to the judgment. Hitherto judgment of ouster could only be entered in cases relating to municipal corporations under the repealed Act, 9 Anne, c. 20, s. 5, but now it may be entered in all cases where the judgment passes for the Crown. Costs may be awarded under the applied order LXV., and an appeal lies to the Court of Appeal, and, as in other cases, is regulated by order LVIII.; but neither of these changes were introduced by the present rules, they had already been effected by reason of the above referred to section 15 of the Judicature Act, 1884, making *quo warranto* a civil proceeding, and order LXVIII. of the rules of 1883 applying order LXV. (Costs) and order LVIII. (Appeals) to all civil proceedings on the Crown side.

The proceeding by writ of error in criminal cases, whether to the Queen's Bench Division or to the Court of Appeal, pursuant to section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873, is to be retained in its old form with little or no variation, except in one important particular with reference to the giving of bail in error. The statute 8 & 9 Vict. c. 68, s. 1, which first provided for the liberation of a prisoner on bail pending a writ of error, was confined to cases of misdemeanour; but rule 199, which embodies the provisions of that Act, does not contain any such restriction. It would, therefore, seem that a prisoner convicted of

however grave an offence—murder or any other atrocious crime—will be absolutely entitled, upon obtaining a writ of error, to be discharged out of custody upon finding sufficient bail, without any discretion on the part of the court or a judge. Rule 183, which provides in what cases error shall lie to the Queen's Bench Division is couched in somewhat vague language. Although the jurisdiction of courts created by commissions of assize, of oyer and terminer, and of gaol delivery, or any of such commissions, is, by section 16 of the Judicature Act, 1873, transferred to the High Court of Justice, yet, inasmuch as section 19 of the Judicature Act, 1875, enacts that, subject to rules, the practice and procedure in all criminal causes and matters are to remain unaltered, it is to be assumed that this rule intends that error is still to lie to the Queen's Bench Division from the courts of assize and Central Criminal Court, as well as from courts of general or quarter sessions. The remaining rules as to error, whether embodying statutory provisions or gathered from the practice cases, merely formulate the practice as it now exists, except that it is no longer obligatory on a plaintiff in error in felony to assign errors in person as hitherto; he may do so by solicitor.

In consequence of the abolition of the Court of Exchequer Chamber and the transference of its jurisdiction to the Court of Appeal by section 18 of the Judicature Act, 1873, a writ of error lies from the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division in a criminal case to that court. The new rules provide for the necessary alterations, and assimilate the practice in the Court of Appeal to that upon error to the Queen's Bench Division. Although the effect of sections 19 and 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873, was to give an appeal to the Court of Appeal in all civil proceedings on the Crown side, it was not until the year 1880 that the proceedings were regulated by rules. In that year order LVIII. (Appeals) of the Rules of the Supreme Court was applied to such appeals. That was again done, in 1883, by order LXVIII., and is now repeated by rule 216, so that the practice is identical with that in any other appeals. As officers have to follow appeals from the particular departments to which they relate, all notices of appeal on the Crown side must be entered at the Crown Office.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

COURT OF APPEAL.

JENNER-FUST v. NEEDHAM—C.A. No. 2, 20th April.

MORTGAGE—FORECLOSURE ACTION—ORDER FOR FORECLOSURE ABSOLUTE—DISCHARGE OF RECEIVER—MONEY IN RECEIVER'S HANDS.

This was an appeal from the decision of Pearson, J., noted *ante*, p. 271. The action was for the foreclosure of a legal mortgage. A receiver of the rents of the mortgaged property had been appointed. The defendants had made default in paying the amount found due from them by the chief clerk's certificate at the time appointed for payment, and the plaintiffs then applied *ex parte* for an order for foreclosure absolute, asking, also, that the receiver might be discharged on passing his accounts, and that he might be ordered to pay over to the plaintiffs a balance which was in his hands. This balance had arisen from rents received by him since the certificate. Pearson, J., required that notice of the application should be served on the defendants, and, on the hearing of the motion in their presence, he held that the rents in the receiver's hands must go in reduction of the amount due to the plaintiffs. He held that a fresh account must be taken. And he gave the defendants a month from the date of the first certificate to redeem on payment of what should then be found due to the plaintiffs, the balance in the receiver's hands going in reduction of the debt. The case was not finally disposed of by the Court of Appeal (COTTON, BOWEN, and FRY, L.J.J.), because it was found that some of the defendants had not been served, and the hearing was to stand over for the purpose of serving them. But their lordships expressed their opinion that the balance in the receiver's hands must go in reduction of what was due to the plaintiffs, and they suggested that, instead of directing a fresh certificate, it would be better that the court should deal with the case itself upon affidavit of what was due to the plaintiffs. COTTON, L.J., pointed out that the practice of appointing a receiver in the case of a legal mortgage had been comparatively recently introduced, and that this was the reason why no precedents were to be found in the books of practice adapted to this state of things. The effect of appointing a receiver was to intercept the right which the mortgagor formerly had to receive the rents himself.—COUNSEL, Higgins, Q.C., and Nalder; Willis-Bund. SOLICITORS, Russell & Hill; A. Hunt.

HIGGINS v. KIRKPATRICK—C.A. No. 2, 20th April.

MORTGAGE—FORECLOSURE ACTION—ORDER FOR FORECLOSURE ABSOLUTE—DISCHARGE OF RECEIVER—MONEY IN RECEIVER'S HANDS.

In this case a similar order had been made by Pearson, J., upon an *ex parte* application for a foreclosure absolute. The Court (COTTON, BOWEN, and FRY, L.J.J.) held that the plaintiffs, under such circumstances, could only have the order they had asked for—i.e., a foreclosure absolute.—COUNSEL, Kekewich, Q.C., and W. Latham. SOLICITORS, Walters, Deverell, & Co.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Re ORD, PENGELLEY v. HERBERT—Pearson J., 17th April.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—EXERCISE OF POWER OF APPOINTMENT—WILLS ACT, s. 24.

The question in this case was whether a testatrix had, by her will, exercised a power of appointment given to her by another will. By her will, executed in 1871, the testatrix, "in pursuance and exercise of the power vested in me by the settlement executed previously to my marriage, and of every power enabling me," appointed "all the property settled by me on my marriage, and over which I have any disposing power" to her husband absolutely. She died in 1884. By the will of a testator who died in 1883 she was entitled to a life interest in, and a power of appointment over, some railway stock. PEARSON, J., held that the will of the testatrix operated as an exercise of the power of appointment given to her by the other will. COUNSEL, Yate-Lee; Latham; Cockson, Q.C. SOLICITORS, Bolton, Robbins, Busk, & Co.; Minet, Harvie, & Smith.

Re THE SHEFFIELD WAGON CO. (LIMITED)—Chitty, J., 16th April.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—MISTAKEN PAYMENT OF DIVIDEND TO SHAREHOLDERS—MISTAKE OF LAW.

In this case the articles of association provided that dividends should be paid to the shareholders in proportion to their shares. For many years the dividends were paid in proportion to the capital paid up. The amount paid up on each of several issues was different. The company went into voluntary liquidation, and, there being a considerable sum for division amongst the shareholders, application was made for a direction that the liquidator should distribute the assets so as to rectify the mistake which had been made as to the proportions in which the shareholders should have received the dividends. CHITTY, J., following *Rogers v. Ingham* (L. R. 3 Ch. D. 351) and *Midland Great Western Railway Co. of Ireland v. Johnson* (6 H. L. C. 798), held that, the dividends having been paid under a mistake of law as to the construction to be given to the articles of association, the sums paid in that way were irrecoverable, and that the mistake could not be rectified in the winding up.—COUNSEL, Ince, Q.C., and Latham; Romer, Q.C., and F. B. Palmer. SOLICITORS, Edward Doyle & Co., for Binney & Sons, Sheffield; Marsland & Co.

MARRIOTT v. CHAMBERLAIN—Q. B. Div., 16th April.

INTERROGATORIES—ANSWERS TO.

This was an appeal from Field, J., at chambers, ordering the plaintiff to deliver further and better answers to the defendant's interrogatories. The question arose out of an action for libel brought by the plaintiff against the defendant. The defendant had alleged that a certain letter to which the plaintiff had referred in a speech, and which purported to be written by the firm of Nettlefold & Chamberlain (of which the defendant was formerly a member) to certain firms in Birmingham, was a fabrication of the plaintiff's. The plaintiff had stated in a letter to the *Standard* newspaper that he had seen a copy of this letter, and at least two copies of it were in existence. Interrogatories were administered by the defendant with the object of ascertaining in whose hands the plaintiff had seen a copy of the letter, and in whose possession the two copies were. The plaintiff declined to answer the interrogatories, on the ground that he intended to call such persons as his witnesses at the trial. The court (A. L. SMITH and MATHEW, JJ.) upheld the order of Field, J., holding that the information was necessary to the defendant to support his case.—COUNSEL, Sir R. E. Webster, Q.C., and Ram; Sir C. Russell, A.G., Sir H. James, Q.C., S. Wright, and Asquith. SOLICITORS, Gedge, Kirby, Millett, & Morse; Sharpe, Parkers, & Co., for Ryland, Martineau, Carlisle, & Goodwin, Birmingham.

BANKRUPTCY CASES.

Ex parte STANFORD, Re BARBER—C.A. No. 1, 17th April.

BILL OF SALE—VALIDITY—DEVIATION FROM STATUTORY FORM—ASSIGNMENT OF CHATTELS "AS BENEFICIAL OWNER" AS SECURITY FOR MONEY—BILLS OF SALE ACT, 1882, ss. 7, 9, 13—CONVEYANCING ACT, 1881, ss. 2, 7.

The question in this case was whether a bill of sale, given by way of security for money, whereby the grantor assigned the chattels "as beneficial owner" to the grantee, was made void by the Bills of Sale Act, 1882. It will be remembered that, in the first instance, the Court of Appeal (Lord Esher, M.R., and Lindley and Lopes, L.J.J.) held that it was not void (*ante*, p. 255). At the desire of the court the appeal was shortly afterwards re-argued before the same judges, the result being that they held the bill of sale to be void (*ante*, p. 256), but at the same time expressed their readiness to allow an appeal to the House of Lords if the defeated party desired it. It was afterwards pointed out to the court that there was no power to allow an appeal to the House of Lords, because, the appeal being from an order of a divisional court made on an appeal from a county court, the decision of the Court of Appeal was made final by the Bankruptcy Appeals (County Courts) Act, 1884. Their lordships then said that the case should be re-argued before the full court. The re-argument took place on the 11th of March before Lord Esher, M.R., and Cotton, Lindley, Bowen, Fry, and Lopes, L.J.J., when judgment was reserved. On the 17th inst. the judgment of the court was delivered, upholding the second decision. BOWEN, L.J., who delivered the judgment

of himself and Lord Esher, M.R., and Cotton, Lindley, and Lopes, L.JJ., said: The first question to be considered is the true construction to be placed upon section 9 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, which enacts that a bill of sale made by way of security for the payment of money is to be void unless made in accordance with the form in the schedule. What legal meaning ought to be attached to the words "in accordance with the form"? Is undeviating conformity required, or, if divergence within limits may be permitted, what are the limits within which such divergence is permissible. It is to be observed in the first place that the section does not avoid bills of sale for not being made in the form of the schedule, but only bills of sale that are not made in accordance with the form. The distinction can scarcely be accidental. When is a bill of sale that is not made in the form given by the 1882 schedule made nevertheless in accordance with such form? According to one view submitted to us the amount of divergence and its materiality must be a question for the judge to consider, and depends upon the simplicity or prolixity, the brevity or the length of the additions engrafted upon the statutory form. This seems a somewhat vague criterion to apply, and one which would leave the validity of bills of sale at the mercy of the particular judge. While it is material to notice the simplicity of the prescribed form, it is, nevertheless, to be remembered that there is nothing about simplicity or prolixity in the Act itself, and it would not be a sound method of construction to introduce a vague definition not found in the statute itself. What, indeed, could be the measure of the simplicity by which such divergence would have to be tested? Would it be the average simplicity of borrowers throughout the kingdom or the feeling of the particular tribunal which decided the case? There is no legal certainty about such a test, and it is based upon nothing in the statute. A sounder interpretation of the words "in accordance with the form" appears to be that which is more in harmony with the recognized maxim of construction, "*Superflua non nocent*." A bill of sale is surely in accordance with the prescribed form if it is substantially in accordance with it, if it does not depart from the prescribed form in any material respect. But a divergence only becomes substantial or material which is one calculated to give the bill of sale a legal consequence or effect, either greater or smaller, than that which would attach to it if drawn in the form which has been sanctioned, or if it departs from the form in a manner calculated to mislead those whom it is the object of the statute to protect. In estimating the effect of a divergence, one must not take into consideration for the moment the provision of section 9, that the bill of sale, if it varies from the form, is to be void, for owing to this statutory penalty no material variation can, in the end, have any legal effect at all. To suppose, for example, that a bill of sale can be brought back into harmony with the statutory form by the mere addition of a proviso that all covenants or conditions at variance with the statutory form are to be disregarded would be absurd. We must take the form interpreted by the light of the Act on the one hand, the instrument to be discussed upon the other; and we must then consider whether, but for the avoidance inflicted by section 9 of the statute, the instrument as drawn will, in virtue either of addition or omission, have any legal effect which either goes beyond or falls short of that which would result from the statutory form, or whether the instrument in respect of such variance would be calculated reasonably to deceive those for whose benefit a statutory form is provided. If so, the variance is material, and the bill of sale is not in substantial accordance with the statutory precedent. Whatever form the bill of sale takes, the form adopted must, in order to be valid, produce, not merely the like effect, but the same effect—that is to say, the legal effect, the whole legal effect, and nothing but the legal effect which it would produce if cast in the exact mould of the schedule. Such a test as this contains no element of uncertainty, is one which every lawyer throughout the kingdom is competent to apply, and is based upon a method of interpretation familiar to our courts. This is the construction we are prepared to put upon the section, and we proceed accordingly to inquire on which side of the line the bill of sale before us falls if this test is to be applied. Although the bill of sale contains several recitals, and in this respect differs from the schedule of the Act, we have not been invited to invalidate it on the ground of such recitals. It would have been impossible for us in any event to have treated the presence of these recitals as fatal, for they are neither misleading, nor do they tend to add to or detract from the legal effect of the document. The real difficulty arises in consequence of section 7 (C.) of the Conveyancing Act, 1881. But for this last-mentioned Act the result which would follow from the introduction of the words "as beneficial owner" would probably be to create a warranty to the effect that the grantor was the beneficial owner, or, in other words, that he had a right to assign the beneficial interest in the property covered by the bill of sale. It is open to doubt, though it is not necessary to express any opinion upon the matter, whether such a warranty would not in any event have been implied, in the absence of rebutting circumstances, from the use in an ordinary bill of sale transaction even of the statutory form. If this doubt were well-founded, the addition of the words "as beneficial owner" might, but for the Conveyancing Act, be the mere expressing of what the law without such expression would imply. But we desire to abstain from indicating any view upon this question, inasmuch as the existence of the Conveyancing Act presents what seems to us a decisive difficulty. By section 7 (C.) of this Act, in all conveyances by way of mortgage (and a bill of sale falls within the definition previously given of a mortgage) there is, when a person conveys and is expressed to convey "as a beneficial owner," to be deemed to be included a covenant, the nature and effect of which we shall presently consider. It is alleged by those who seek to impeach the present bill of sale that, but for the consequences inflicted by the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, upon want of accordance with the form, the Conveyancing Act would apply to the present instrument and would have the effect of incorporating

into it the covenant in question. We are of opinion that this view is correct. We think that section 7 (C.) of the Conveyancing Act did apply to all bills of sale under the then existing law, and that it is only in virtue of the special provisions of the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, and, among others, of the enactment prescribing conformity with the scheduled form, that section 7 (C.) of the Conveyancing Act would fail to apply to the present instrument. What remains, therefore, to be considered is, whether the introduction into this bill of sale, by virtue of the words "as beneficial owner" of the covenant set forth in section 7 (C.) of the Conveyancing Act would, if such introduction were lawful, give to the bill of sale a legal effect different from that which it would have if the statutory form had been followed and if the words "as beneficial owner" had been omitted. The covenant to be found in section 7 (C.) of the Conveyancing Act embraces under the head of a single covenant several independent covenants or warranties. First comes a covenant as to title. We leave open the question to which we have already alluded—whether this express covenant for title would add anything beyond what was already involved by implication in the use of the statutory form? The next provision in order is a covenant that, if default is made in payment of principal or interest, it shall be lawful for the grantee to enter into and upon, or receive, and thenceforth quietly hold, occupy, and enjoy, or take and have, the subject-matter expressed to be conveyed or any part thereof, without any lawful interruption or disturbance by the person who so conveys, or any person conveying by his direction, or any other person, not being a person claiming in respect of an estate or interest subject whereto the conveyance is expressly made. This covenant gives, upon default of payment, an immediate power of entry, and, impliedly, a power of removing forthwith and of selling the property conveyed. We are compelled to say that the importation of such a covenant into the bill of sale would give to it a legal effect beyond that involved in the use of the simpler scheduled form. The scheduled form must be read by the light of the Act to which it is scheduled, and in particular by the light of section 13. The true effect of this scheduled form, read by the light of section 13, is to pass the entire property, no doubt, to the grantee, but not to give him the power of immediate removal until five days' interval shall have elapsed. The introduction of the covenant from the Conveyancing Act would do away with the benefit of these five days. Such a variation from the statutory form may appear to be slight, but, as it would, if it could be effectually made, alter the legal rights of the parties from the legal rights which the scheduled form gives, we are of opinion that it is a variation sufficient to prevent our holding that the bill of sale under discussion is made "in accordance with" the statutory form. It therefore must be declared void. FRY, L.J., agreed in holding that the use of the words "as beneficial owner" had the effect of introducing into the statutory form covenants not authorized as terms "for the maintenance of the security," and that the bill of sale was void under section 9 of the Act of 1882. But he was not prepared to agree with the other members of the court in the rule of construction which they had laid down in respect of section 9. A bill of sale might contain everything which the statutory form contained, and might have no further or other operation in law than a bill of sale in that form would have and yet, in his opinion, it might not be "in accordance with" the form. If it was introduced by prolix and useless recitals, and then followed up in every member with all the prolixity for which conveyancing was once celebrated, it might have in the end precisely the same legal effect as a document in the statutory form, but it would not, in his opinion, accord with it. The Act of 1882 dealt in an imperious manner, not with the substance only, but with the form of the instrument, and section 9, in its demand for accordance with the scheduled form, had no words of indulgence, such as "to the like purport or effect." His lordship inclined to think that the Legislature, for the purpose of imposing a stringent check on the freedom of contract in respect of loans on chattels, had required the contract to be clothed in a particular form under pain of nullity.—COUNSEL, Cookson, Q.C., Cooper Willis, Q.C., and Herbert Reed; Sir H. Davey, S.G., Winslow, Q.C., and C. E. Jones. SOLICITORS, Coburn & Young; Randall & Bucknill.

CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS.

Re ROBERT DUNDAS STRONG (A SOLICITOR)—C. A. No. 2, 15th April.

SOLICITOR AND CLIENT—MISCONDUCT OF SOLICITOR—JURISDICTION TO STRIKE OFF THE ROLLS—ATTACHMENT—MONEY FOUND DUE FROM SOLICITOR AFTER ORDER STRIKING HIM OFF THE ROLLS—DEBTORS' ACT, 1869 (32 & 33 VICT. c. 62), s. 4, SUB-SECTION 4—DEBTORS' ACT, 1878 (41 & 42 VICT. c. 54), s. 1.

This was an appeal from the order made by Kay, J. (*ante*, p. 111), to strike the above solicitor off the rolls, and for an account of moneys due from him to his clients, and there was another appeal from the order of Kay, J. (*ante*, p. 405), for an attachment against the solicitor for non-payment of the money found due from him on the account. In June, 1881, Strong was in great pecuniary difficulties. He was acquainted, through his wife, with three young unmarried ladies, whose principal means of support consisted of some house property which was subject to a mortgage of small amount. These young ladies were induced by Strong and his wife to lend him a sum of £670. At the same time he undertook to act as their solicitor. As security for the loan so made, he purported to mortgage to the ladies a policy on his life, which was, however, already heavily encumbered; and he entered into no covenant to keep up the policy. He also handed to them a guarantee of his wife and sister, but his wife did not sign this document. Strong subsequently received from the ladies a further sum of £135, which he suggested to them should be

temporarily invested upon the security of costs owing to him, which costs he himself afterwards received. The £670 advanced by the ladies had been obtained from some bankers with whom the title-deeds of the house property had been deposited as security, the prior mortgage being discharged out of additional sums advanced by the bankers. On the 28th of February, 1882, the bankers issued a writ against the ladies in an action to enforce this security, and Strong acted as their solicitor. He put in, on their part, a defence which, he said, was for the purpose of delay, declining to admit that they had signed any document charging the property, and denying that any money was due. An order was made for a receiver, and another order for an affidavit of documents, and a motion was made for the attachment of the ladies for not making such affidavit. On the 5th of June, 1882, an arrangement was made by the bankers with Strong to abandon this motion for attachment, if he would consent to an order for sale of the houses. On the 1st of July judgment was taken by consent for sale, on default of payment in six months. Afterwards a receiver was appointed, and he gave notice to the tenants to pay their rents to him. One of the tenants sent this notice to one of the three ladies, who thereupon communicated with Strong, and, according to her statement, he said that the receiver was a new clerk of his, and that it was very stupid of him to make such a mistake; that she must take no notice of it; and that he would see that it did not happen again. The same lady deposed that the existence of the litigation was altogether concealed from her by Strong. When the real state of affairs became known to the ladies, some friends of theirs came forward to assist them in the matter, and, having made arrangements for a transfer of the securities, they brought Strong's conduct before the court. Kay, J. (*ante*, p. 111), ordered Strong's name to be struck off the roll, and that an account of the moneys due from him should be taken, and the amount found due paid by him within a month after the chief clerk had made his certificate. The £670 debt having been otherwise dealt with, the only sum found due by the certificate was the £135 and interest, amounting, altogether, to £192 10s. Strong did not pay this sum within the month, and an application was made, under the Debtors' Act, 1869, s. 4, subsection 4, for an attachment against him, on the ground that his default was default by a solicitor "in payment of a sum of money when ordered to pay the same in his character of an officer of the court making the order." Kay, J. (*ante*, p. 405), on the 8th inst., made the order, but directed that the writ should not issue till the appeal against his order striking Strong off the roll had been decided. The appeal from the second order was heard immediately after that from the first order had been disposed of. The Court of Appeal (COTTON, BOWEN, and FRY, L.J.) affirmed both orders. COTTON, L.J., said that the first order was divided into two parts, the first part ordering the solicitor to be struck off the roll, and the other directing an account, and ordering payment of the moneys received by him from the clients. It was objected that the first part prevented the court from exercising the power in the second. It was true that, after a solicitor had been struck off the roll, the court's power over him as one of its officers was gone, but the time to ascertain whether the court had power to make the order was the time at which the order was made. The objection, therefore, could not prevail. Strong's wife was a friend of the ladies, and applied to them to help her husband; and there was an important letter from him to one of the ladies, in which he offered to look into her affairs without making any charge. The advance of £670 by the bankers was made on the security of the deeds and of a promissory note signed by the ladies and by Strong. Strong made the offer in the letter referred to as a solicitor, and in the document signed to carry into effect the loan he was described as the ladies' solicitor. He was then a ruined man; he had his profession, no doubt, but his future earnings were encumbered, and he did not suggest that he could provide for the repayment of the loan, and he never told the ladies that they might be liable to be sued personally and have their houses sold, as they would have been, if their friends had not come in and made an arrangement with regard to them. His allowing the ladies so to charge their property without telling them the risk they ran was most improper; it would have been very improper for a solicitor to have allowed them to make the mortgage, even after telling them of the risk. He had in that matter acted as no solicitor ought to act. But there was another transaction in which his conduct was worse. He obtained from the ladies a loan of £135 for one or two months, and gave a promissory note. The loan was to be repaid out of certain costs payable to him. These costs, which amounted to less than £130, were afterwards paid to him, but, instead of paying the sum over to the ladies, he wrote to them, saying he was investing some money on mortgage and wanted £100 more, as he had not yet received the sum for costs which had been spoken of. It did not appear that the £100 had been advanced. If the ladies had made that advance Strong could have been indicted for obtaining money under false pretences. It was true that he had not received the full sum he had mentioned as due to him for costs, because when taxed and paid the sum was a few pounds less; but he could not receive any more, so that in that last letter there was yet another misrepresentation. Therefore, although the consequences were less in the second transaction, Strong's conduct was certainly worse. Having regard to his conduct in both the transactions, it was clear that he was not fit to be kept on the roll of solicitors. The sentence was heavy and severe, but Strong's misconduct as a solicitor was proved, and the court would not interfere with the decision of the learned judge. BOWEN, L.J., said that Strong had done a cruel and heartless wrong under colour, not merely of friendship, but of confidence as a solicitor. He had been guilty of a fraudulent breach of trust, and could not be allowed to remain on the roll of solicitors. It was a terrible sentence, as it put an end to his means of earning a livelihood, and the court ought to think not once, but twice and even thrice, before it awarded such a punishment; but many a poverty-stricken person had been sent to prison for an offence not more

clearly proved. FRY, L.J., was unable to find anything to extenuate Strong's conduct, and, therefore, agreed entirely.

On the appeal from the order for attachment it was, on behalf of the solicitor, urged—first, that though the order could be made and was made against Strong because he was a solicitor, yet it was not made against him in his character of an officer of the court; and, secondly, that as the default in payment was not made till a month after the certificate it was not a default by a solicitor, Strong having been some time before struck off the roll. COTTON, L.J., said that the first objection was that the order was not made against the solicitor in the character of an officer of the court, because the money was due under an agreement between him and the clients. But the only thing which gave jurisdiction to make the order in a summary way was that it was made against him in his character as a solicitor. The other objection was that the default was not default by a solicitor, because when it was made Strong had been struck off the roll. Section 4 of the Act was perhaps not perfectly clear, but, in his lordship's opinion, it meant that the time at which it was to apply was the time when the act was done. In this case the jurisdiction to make the order only existed while Strong was a solicitor, and it was sufficient to shew that the section applied when the order for the account was made. BOWEN and FRY, L.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Graham Hastings, Q.C.*, and *Sidney Woolf; W. Pearson, Q.C.*, and *Leonard Field*. SOLICITORS, *G. Castle; J. W. Sykes*.

Re EMANUEL AND SIMMONDS—Pearson, J., 17th April.

COSTS—TAXATION—SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION ACT, 1881, ss. 2, 4—GENERAL ORDER OF AUGUST, 1882, CLAUSE 2 (B.), (C.)—SCHEDULE 1, PART 2—SCALE FEE FOR PREPARING LEASE—RIGHT TO CHARGE SEPARATELY FOR PRIOR AGREEMENT FOR LEASE.

The question in this case was whether the scale fee mentioned in part 2 of schedule 1 to the Solicitors' Remuneration Order of August, 1882, as payable to a "lessor's solicitor for preparing, settling, and completing lease and counterpart," included the solicitor's charges for preparing a prior agreement for the lease, or whether the solicitor was entitled to charge separately and in addition for the agreement under schedule 2. The agreement to grant the lease was executed in May, 1885. The lease was to be in a form set forth in a schedule to the agreement. The agreement provided that the lessee should, on the lessor's fulfilling and performing certain stipulations as to repairs and alterations of the demised premises, accept the lease and execute a counterpart, and that the lessee should pay the expenses of, and incidental to, the preparing and executing the agreement and the lease and counterpart, but that the obligations of the lease on the lessee's part should commence only from the date of the completion of the works stipulated for by the agreement, and possession being given to the lessee complete in accordance with those stipulations. Possession was to be given as soon as the works were completed, and not later than the 1st of March, 1885, and in this respect time was to be of the essence of the agreement. Possession was duly given to the lessee, and the lessor's solicitors claimed to be entitled to charge for the preparation of the agreement under schedule 2 to the Remuneration Order, in addition to the scale fee for the lease. The taxing master held, on the authority of *Re Field* (L. R. 29 Ch. D. 608, 29 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 438), that the scale fee included the preparation of the agreement, and PEARSON, J., affirmed the decision. On behalf of the solicitors, reliance was placed on the heading of part 2 of schedule 1—"Scale of charges as to leases or agreements for leases"—and it was urged that these words shewed that an agreement for a lease was not intended to be included in the charge for a lease. In the case of a sale, in part 1 of schedule 1, "preparation of contract" was expressly mentioned as included in the scale fee. And, in the present case, the agreement was something more than an agreement to grant a lease; it provided for the execution of works preliminary to the lease. PEARSON, J., said that he was bound by the decision in *Re Field*. There it was held that the scale fee for the preparation of a lease included the solicitor's remuneration for the negotiations which preceded the lease, on the ground that those negotiations were, within the meaning of clause 2 of the order, "business connected with" the lease. In his lordship's opinion the preparation of the agreement in the present case was equally "business connected with" the lease. The scale fee was intended to be an entire fee for the preparation of the lease and anything connected with it, and of the agreement for a lease, if no lease was granted.—COUNSEL, *Alexander; Stirling*. SOLICITORS, *Emanuel & Simmonds; Druce, Jackson, & Attles*.

SOCIETIES.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

On Wednesday the fifty-sixth half-yearly meeting of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association was held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Mr. W. EDWOOD SHIRLEY (Doncaster) taking the chair.

The report which was laid before the meeting stated that since the last report, in October, 1885, forty new members had been admitted. The aggregate number of solicitors in England and Wales now enrolled as members of the association was 2,943, of whom 1,058 were life, and 1,885 annual subscribers. Fifty-two life members were also contributors of annual subscriptions ranging from one to ten guineas each. During the half-year the receipts of the association, from all sources, had amounted to £1,900 12s. The purchase of a sum of £250 New Two-and-a-half per

Cent. Stock having been completed in September last, the total invested capital of the association now consisted of £45,979 19s. 9d. stock, producing half-yearly dividends of about £800. There was also the sum of £5,048 10s. 5d. Met. Three-and-a-half per Cent. Stock pertaining to the Reardon Bequest. Many distressing cases had been considered by the directors during the half-year. Each application had received careful consideration, and a sum of £1,283 had been distributed in grants to necessitous cases. Of this amount £360 was given in the relief of eight cases of members' families, and £923 in fifty-two cases of non-members and the families of non-members. The total grants were largely in excess of any corresponding half-year previously. The sum of £75 had also been duly paid to annuitants from the income of the late Miss Ellen Reardon's bequest. The statement of accounts showed that at the close of the half-year a balance of £388 5s. 6d. remained to the credit of the association at the Union Bank of London, together with a further balance of £154 8s. 5d. belonging to the Reardon Trust account; the sum of £15 remained in the hands of the secretary. The directors have received an intimation from Messrs. Rowley & Chatwin, of Birmingham, that the late Mr. John Mason, solicitor, of Bilston, had bequeathed a sum of £100 (free of duty) to the association. This legacy had not yet been received, but was payable within twelve months from the date of Mr. Mason's decease in January last. While again seeking the individual help of members in their respective localities in obtaining new supporters of the association, the board desired to record their thanks to those local committees that had lately taken up the good cause. The result of the work undertaken by the Cardiff local committee had been very encouraging, and their first annual report showed that they had fifty-six subscribers in Cardiff and the neighbourhood, and the report expressed a hope that other friends of the association would follow their example in their energetic efforts on behalf of the funds. Mr. G. B. Gregory, M.P., had kindly promised to preside at the anniversary festival in June next.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the report, expressed his regret that Mr. J. Anderson Rose, the chairman of the association, was not able to be present. He thought those present would agree with him that the report was in every respect satisfactory, and, as compared with the corresponding period last year, it was even more satisfactory. He learned that at no corresponding period had more relief been distributed than during the last year. He was told—and he was sure he believed it—that every case which had come before them had been investigated as thoroughly as possible, and the directors had again been able to meet all cases which they had considered fit and proper for relief. There was one matter connected with the society, and which had been pointedly alluded to in the report, to which he begged to call very special attention—that was that some increased effort should be made to increase the income of the society. They were aware that there were three sources of income—that from life subscribers; that from annual subscribers; and that from the annual festival, which, he was happy to say, was always productive of a very large amount of good. He had read, with the utmost pleasure, what had been done in the town of Cardiff, and he begged, on his own behalf and on that of the society, to express their very grateful thanks to those friends at Cardiff who had been so successful and earnest in their endeavours to obtain subscriptions. Having been all his life connected with societies of one kind or another—chiefly religious—he was quite sure that, if they wanted increased subscriptions, they could only be obtained by a personal canvass. This seemed to have been done at Cardiff, and it was very satisfactory to find that the number of subscribers there was fifty-six. He was happy to find that the association had this year received, or were about to receive, a legacy from Mr. John Mason of £100. That was another source, not of income, exactly, but of capital, which, according to the system which had been fostered—and, he thought, very judiciously fostered—had been from time to time invested. Before he sat down, he must also express his great satisfaction that Mr. Gregory had consented to preside at the next festival. They all respected and esteemed Mr. Gregory, and he did not believe there was any member of the House of Commons more useful and effective in regard to the profession wherever he took an interest, and he (the chairman) was sure the association would have his best services. There were also fifty gentlemen whose names were down as stewards, and he hoped, before the day arrived for the festival, that the number would be largely increased. This was not a time when the society would be likely to cease to be beneficial. He thought they would all admit that business was not what it was. People had an idea that solicitors flourished when other people were in decay and depression; but a greater fallacy had never existed. The solicitors and the legal profession were flourishing when other people were flourishing, and they partook of depression when other people were depressed. But in spite of that they found a large increase in the profession year by year. When he was in London he spent a good deal of his time in the library of the Law Society, and he declared solemnly that his heart failed him when he saw the number of young men crowding into the profession, and knew from his own personal experience that the business was so much decreased and the profits lessened. That being so, so far from there being a diminution of applicants for benevolent assistance, they might depend upon it that there would be an increase.

Mr. SIDNEY SMITH seconded the motion, observing that he quite endorsed the observations of the chairman. He had mentioned, when taking the chair at Sheffield some years ago, that the amount of the subscription required from members of the profession was less than would be paid by any ordinary mechanic in a benefit society, and he was at a loss to understand why the younger members of the profession did not join the association. There were 13,000 or 14,000 solicitors on the rolls, and, including life members, the association numbered only 3,000.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. DAY moved a vote of thanks to the directors and auditors for their services, and spoke of the courtesy he had received in bringing a case before them.

Mr. BOODLE seconded the motion, which was agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. W. BELLIAN BROOKE moved a vote of thanks to the chairman for presiding, observing that they were more particularly indebted to him in that he had come a long way in order to be present.

Mr. HEDGER seconded, and the motion was carried with acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN briefly returned thanks, which terminated the proceedings.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS BURY, solicitor (of the firm of Acton, Bury, & Acton), of Wrexham, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Denbighshire (Mr. Henry Warter Meredith) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Bury is town clerk of Wrexham. He was admitted a solicitor in 1865.

Mr. WILLIAM MEIGH GOODMAN, Attorney-General of British Honduras, has been appointed Chief Justice of that Colony, in succession to Mr. William Anthony Musgrave Sheriff, who has been appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court of the Straits Settlements. Chief Justice Goodman is the fourth son of Mr. Samuel Robert Goodman. He was educated at University College, London, and he graduated B.A. at the University of London in 1867. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1867, and he formerly practised on the Home Circuit. He was appointed Attorney-General and Admiralty Advocate for British Honduras in 1883.

Mr. GEORGE HENRY PAGE, solicitor, of Hay, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Brecknockshire (Mr. Thomas Wood) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Page was admitted a solicitor in 1865. He is registrar of the Hay County Court.

Mr. HENRY PENROSE PRANCE, solicitor (of the firm of Stephens, Prance, & Prance), of Plymouth, has been appointed a Commissioner to Administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. HERBERT NEW, solicitor, of Birmingham and Edgbaston, has been appointed a Commissioner to Administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM RICHARDS, solicitor, of Nottingham, has been appointed Clerk to the Long Eaton School Board, in succession to the late Mr. John Black. Mr. Richards was admitted a solicitor in 1859.

Mr. EDWARD THOMAS RICE WOOD, solicitor (of the firm of Wood & Talbot), of Rhayader, Newtown, and Llanidloes, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Radnorshire (Sir Herbert Frankland Lewis, Bart.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Wood was admitted a solicitor in 1881. He is registrar of the Rhayader County Court, and clerk to the county magistrates at that place.

Mr. ARTHUR HENRY TURNER, solicitor (of the firm of Turner & Chanter), of Wotton-under-Edge, has been appointed Clerk to the Governors of the Wotton-under-Edge Grammar School. Mr. Turner was admitted a solicitor in 1869.

Mr. WILLIAM PICTON EVANS, solicitor (of the firm of Jenkins & Evans), of Cardigan, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Cardiganshire (Mr. John C. Harford) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Evans was admitted in 1861, and is registrar of the Cardigan County Court.

DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP.

GEORGE HARRISON RYCROFT and THOMAS PERCY BELLHOUSE, solicitors (Rycroft & Bellhouse), Manchester. March 31. The said Thomas Percy Bellhouse will continue to practise on his own account under the firm of Rycroft & Bellhouse. [Gazette, April 20.]

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON			
APPEAL COURT	APPEAL COURT	V. C. BACON.	Mr. Justice KAY.
Date.	No. 1.	No. 2.	
Wed., Apr. 28	Mr. King	Mr. Pugh	Mr. Carrington
Thursday, 29	Farrer	Lavie	Jackson
Friday, 30	Pemberton	Pugh	Carrington
Sat., May 1	Ward	Lavie	Jackson
		Mr. Justice CHITTY.	Mr. Justice PRABSON.
Wednesday April, 28	Mr. Leach	Mr. Ward	Mr. Koe
Thursday, 29	Beal	Pemberton	Clowes
Friday, 30	Leach	Ward	Koe
Saturday, May 1	Beal	Pemberton	Clowes

EASTER VACATION.

Mr. Justice Mathew will be Vacation Judge from Thursday, the 22nd of April, to Wednesday, the 28th of April, both days inclusive. Papers in any urgent matters during that time may be sent to his lordship by

post, addressed to 46, Queen's Gate-gardens, S.W. Mr. Justice Mathew will sit in the Queen's Bench Judges' Chambers on Wednesday, the 28th of April, at eleven o'clock. Mr. Justice A. L. Smith will be Vacation Judge from Thursday, the 29th of April, to Monday, the 3rd of May, both days inclusive, and his lordship will be in attendance at Queen's Bench Judges' Chambers on Friday, the 30th of April, and Monday, the 3rd of May, at eleven o'clock. On those days when his lordship is not sitting at chambers, papers in urgent matters may be sent to him by post, addressed to 40, Cadogan-square, S.W.

THE SPRING ASSIZES.

South-Eastern Circuit (Pollock, B.)—Ipwich, Tuesday, May 4; Cambridge, Thursday, May 13; Hertford, Wednesday, May 19; Lewes, Monday, May 24. Northern Circuit (Huddleston, B., and Grantham, J.)—Carlisle, Tuesday, May 4; Manchester, Friday, May 7; Liverpool, Wednesday, May 19. Mr. Justice Grantham will proceed alone to Carlisle, but will be joined at Manchester and Liverpool by Baron Huddleston. North and South Wales Circuits (Hawkins, J.)—Carnarvon, Wednesday, May 5; Chester, Friday, May 7; Swansea, Friday, May 14. Oxford Circuit (Stephen, J.)—Reading, Tuesday, May 4; Stafford, Saturday, May 8; Worcester, Monday, May 17. Midland Circuit (Mathew, J.)—Northampton, Wednesday, May 5; Lincoln, Tuesday, May 11; Derby, Saturday, May 15; Warwick, Friday, May 21. North-Eastern Circuit (Cave and Wills, JJ.)—Newcastle, Monday, May 3; Durham, Friday, May 7; Leeds, Thursday, May 13. Mr. Justice Wills will proceed alone to Newcastle and Durham, and will be joined at Leeds by Mr. Justice Cave. Western Circuit (Day, J.)—Winchester, Tuesday, May 4; Exeter, Thursday, May 13; Taunton, Thursday, May 20.

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES. LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

OROC SUGAR FACTORY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Bacon, V.C., has, by an order dated March 25, appointed John Francis Clarke, 41, Coleman st., to be official liquidator.

ISLE OF WIGHT SEA, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented April 12, directed to be heard before Bacon, V.C., on May 8. Whitfield, Finsbury pavement, solicitor for the petitioners.

LONDON AND COUNTY INVESTMENT CORPORATION, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Henry Young, 74, Coleman st. Wednesday, June 23 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

METROPOLITAN GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors within the United Kingdom are required, on or before May 17, and creditors resident out of the United Kingdom are required, on or before Aug 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Threlkeld Edwards, 66, Coleman st. Friday, May 24 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims of such of the creditors as are resident within the United Kingdom, and Tuesday, Oct 26 at 12, for the creditors resident out of the United Kingdom.

PUMPION COUSING COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Kay, J., dated April 5, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Nye and Co, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st., solicitors for the petitioner.

SAFETY BLASTING POWDER COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Kay, J., dated Feb 13, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Lane and Co, Queen Victoria st., solicitors for the petitioners. His lordship has fixed Thursday, April 29 at 12, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

SEYMOUR AND SHERBOURNE TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Kay, J., dated April 5, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Hilbery, Billiter st., solicitors for the petitioner.

WALKER AND HACKING, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr George Yates, 15, Wilson st, Bury. Thursday, May 20 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. [Gazette, April 18.]

DEVON AND CORNWALL DAIRY FARM COMPANY, LIMITED.—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated March 25, appointed John James Deverell, 96, Camden rd, Camden Town, official liquidator in the place and stead of William Henry Edwards.

MASONIC AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated April 8, appointed Frederick Bertram Smart, 22, Queen st, Cheapside, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before May 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Monday, June 7 at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

MONT DORE OF BOURNEMOUTH, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented April 15, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on May 8. Ingledew and Co, Fenchurch st., solicitors for the petitioner.

ROSEHILL HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED.—Kay, J., has, by an order dated April 16, appointed Richard Hill Read, 4, Osborne grove, Tollington park, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before May 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Friday, May 21 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. [Gazette, April 20.]

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER. LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BRITISH RE-INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Bristowe, V.C., dated April 12, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Boote and Edgar, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner.

LIVERPOOL, MANCHESTER, AND BIRMINGHAM INDUSTRIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented April 15, directed to be heard before the Deputy of the Chancellor, at 9, Cook st, Liverpool, on Monday, May 3 at 11. Pennock and Guest, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner. [Gazette, April 20.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

LAMB FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Lamb Inn, Box. Wills. April 14.

WOODSTOCK UNITED BRETHREN FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Crown Inn, Woodstock, Oxford. April 13. [Gazette, April 18.]

SUSPENDED FOR THREE MONTHS.

MUSIC PUBLISHERS' AND CONCERT ASSISTANTS' PROVIDENT SOCIETY, St James's Hall, Piccadilly. April 13. [Gazette, April 18.]

CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BENNION, ISAAC, Ancoats, Manchester, Plumber. May 8. Bennion v Bennion, Registrar, Manchester. Higham, Manchester.

DUNN, ADAM, Eastfield, Pattingham, York, Gent. May 7. Dunn v Dunn, Chitty, J. Hamlin, Staple inn, Holborn.

MESSENT, JOHN, Hinde st, Manchester sq, Esq. May 10. Briton Medical and General Life Association, Limited, v Messent, Kay, J. Chubb, Lincoln's inn fields.

NEAL, JOHN, Senr, Ibstock, Leicester, Farmer. May 4. Weston v Neal, Bacon, V.C. Wight, Dudley.

RYE, ADAM, Cobham, Surrey, Gardener. May 4. Lee v Rye, Bacon, V.C. Rye, Rye, Rye's inn fields.

THOMSON, JAMES, Wray, Lancaster, Esq. May 4. Holmes v Harvey, Bacon, V.C. Hartley, Settle.

[Gazette, April 9.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP 36. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

ATCHESON, DAVID, Birkenhead, Chester, Plumber. April 27. Thompson, Birkenhead.

BALFOUR, CATHERINE, Elliot pl, Blackheath, Ostrich Feather Merchant. April 29. Kingsbury, Bank house.

BELLHOUSE, WAINWRIGHT, Rusholme, Manchester, Gent. June 3. Almond, Manchester.

BELLI, Rev CHARLES ALMERIC, South Weald, Essex, Clerk. May 10. Freshfields and Williams, Bank bridge.

BETTS, BETTIE FLORENCE, Marlborough hill, St John's Wood. April 30. Todd & Co, Chancery lane.

BIGNELL, SUBANNAH, Banbury, Oxford. May 1. Fortescue and Sons, Banbury.

BIRKIN, ALFRED, Ryde, Isle of Wight. May 5. Pope, Grecian chambers, Temple.

BRIDGWOOD, GEORGE WOOLLEY, Forebridge, nr Stafford, Malster. May 29. Twynam, Stafford.

BROOKS, JAMES HENRY, Henley upon Thames, Surgeon. May 26. Blandy and Witherington, Reading.

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE, Earl of, Right Hon. AUGUSTUS EDWARD, Great Missenden, Buckingham. May 21. Cookson and Co, Lincoln's inn fields.

CARPENTER, JAMES, Darlaston, Stafford, Railway Signaller. April 30. Arnold, Birmingham.

COHEN, EDWARD, Harley st, Merchant. May 22. Hollams and Co, Mincing lane.

EDWARDS, JOHN, Kingston, Hereford, Gent. May 20. Temple and Philipin, Kingston.

FOY, JOHN, Osborn cottages, South Acton. May 10. Robinson and Son, Charterhouse.

FURBER, MARGARET, Bath. May 10. Blandy and Witherington, Reading.

GEE, MARY POOLE, Macclesfield, Chester. June 1. Hand, Macclesfield.

HEATHCOTE, COCKSHUTT, Raleigh, Northam, Devon, Esq. June 1. Wilde & Co, College hill.

HIGGINS, JOHN, Hampstead rd, House Painter. June 1. Woolley and Hughes, Great Winchester st, Old Broad st.

HIGGINS, SARAH, Hampstead rd. June 1. Woolley and Hughes, Great Winchester st, Old Broad st.

HINCHCLIFFE, JOHN JUBB, Barneley, York, Gent. May 12. Foster and Raper, Pontefract.

HOSACK, JAMES, Cape Town, South Africa, Bank Manager. June 1. Turner and Low, King st, Cheapside.

KINGHLEY, ISABELLA, Blackburn. May 12. Wilding and Son, Blackburn.

LUDOLF, MARLA, Haddingley, near Leeds. April 26. North and Sons, Leeds.

LYNN, ROBERT HUGOUP, Newcastle upon Tyne, Iron Merchant. May 31. Dickinson and Miller, Newcastle upon Tyne.

MARRIAN, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Ironfounder. April 30. Foster, Birmingham.

METCALFE, JANE, Keld, York. May 23. Leeman and Co, York.

MILLINCHIPP, JOHN, Stourbridge, Worcester, Tailor. May 24. Wyndham, Stourbridge.

PARTRIDGE, HENRY, Topsham, Devon. May 10. Orchard, Exeter.

PATTERSON, ELIZABETH, Windermere, Westmoreland. April 12. Sharp and Son, Lancaster.

PHILLIPS, JOHN, Pontesbury, Birchill, Stafford, Gent. Nov 21. Phillips, Birmingham.

SHARP, ROBERT, Barrow in Furness, Contractor's Clerk. April 24. Pearson, Barrow in Furness.

SMITH, ELIZABETH SHAW, Sparkhill, Worcester. May 1. Benle and Co, Birmingham.

TAYLOR, ALFRED, Bradford, York, Woolstapler. June 30. Killick and Co, Bradford.

TICKLE, GEORGE, Westleigh, Lancaster, Yeoman. June 1. Lancashire, Manchester.

VERNON, ROBERT, Chorlton upon Medlock, Manchester, Gent. May 15. Sutton and Elliott, Manchester.

WALTON, THOMAS TODD, Wincanton, Somerset, Esq. June 1. Girdlestone, Albany Court yard, Piccadilly.

WASS, EDWARD MILLER, Matlock Bath, Derby, Esq. May 22. Mee and Co, East Retford.

WEBB, THOMAS, Clapham Common, Esq. May 7. Hubbard and Co, Cannon st.

WILLIAMS, JOHN JONES. May 22. Robotham and Co, Derby.

WILLIS, ANNIE, Praed st, Paddington, Tobaccoconist. May 8. Meynell, Furniva st.

WOOD, CHARLES WILLIAM, Paignton, Devon, Barrister at Law. April 24. Lucas and Son, Fenchurch st.

[Gazette, April 9.]

BEADWELL, JOHN ALFRED, Newtown, Montgomery, Gent. June 1. Talbot and Wood, Newtown.

BEVERLEY, RICHARD, Weston super Mare, Gent. May 29. Hooper, Birmingham.

BINNEY, FREDERICK, Stratford pl, Esq. May 8. Bowker and Co, Bedford row.

BRADST, SARAH, Granby st, Hampstead rd. May 16. Whitfield Jackson, Brecknock rd.

BRYAN, Rev WILLIAM BRYAN, Haigh, Lancaster. May 6. Peace and Ellis, Wigan.

CUTLER, JOHN THOMAS, Craven hill gdns, Hyde pk, Esq. April 31. Newey, Birmingham.

HARVEY, GEORGE, Bristol, Saddler. May 1. Brown, Bristol.

JONES, EVAN, Newport, Monmouth, Saddler. May 15. Danney, Newport.

LEONARD, MARY, Abbey rd, St John's Wood. May 24. Bales and Co, Bethers st.

MARSHALL, HENRY, Greenwich, Kent. June 7. Langlois and Biden, Leadenhall st.

MOODY, THOMAS, Warminster, Wilts, Gent. June 24. Chapman and Ponting, Warminster.

NEAL, WILLIAM, Potternewton, Leeds, Gent. June 15. Emsley, Leeds.

PHILLIPS, ELIZABETH FRANCES, Ystradavall, Carmarthen. May 10. Barker and Co, Carmarthen.

PHILLIPS, VAUGHAN LLOYD, Ystradavall, Carmarthen, Esq. May 10. Barker and Co, Carmarthen.

RIDSDALE, WILLIAM, Mansfield, Nottingham, Gent. May 20. Bryan, Mansfield
 ROGERS, JAMES, Yateley, Hants, Farmer. May 20. Cooke, Wokingham
 RUDD, HENRY, Sowerby, nr Thirsk, York, Corn Factor. June 12. Hunton and
 Bolsover, Stockton on Tees
 RUSSELL, JOHN, Manchester, Linen Manufacturer. June 1. Ellis, Manchester
 SCOTT, ELEANOR ANN, Sudbury Lodge, St Leonard's on Sea. May 24. Hare and
 Co, Surrey st, Strand
 SEVIER, ELIZABETH, Malsemore Lodge, Gloucester. May 10. Barker and Co,
 Carmarthen
 SHARP, SAMUEL, Ohlworth, Surrey, Gunpowder Manufacturer. May 2. Sharp,
 Walbrook
 SNELLING, THOMAS, Lower Tulse hill, Surrey, Esq. May 18. Sandilands and Co,
 Finchchurch avenue
 SUMMERFIELD, ELIZA MARGARET, Arundel ter, Wandsworth common. May 20.
 Stevens, Queen Victoria st
 SUMMERFIELD, SARAH, Arundel ter, Wandsworth common. May 20. Stevens,
 Queen Victoria st
 TURNER, JOHN ABRAHAM, Liverpool, Merchant Tailor. April 27. Collins, Liver-
 pool
 WESLEY, THOMAS ALEXANDER, Wandsworth rd, Licensed Victualler. May 18.
 Siddons and Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury sq
 WILCOX, THOMAS, Leamington, Warwick, Labourer. May 9. Overell and Son,
 Leamington

[Gazette, April 13.]

BAILEY, JAMES, Chorlton upon Medlock, Manchester, Postmaster. May 8. Mann
 and Rooke, Manchester
 BAWTERE, FRANCIS, Witham, Essex, Esq. May 15. Stevens and Co, Mildred's
 ct, Poultry
 BEST, ROBERT WARREN, Exeter, Architect. May 31. Tozer and Co, Exeter
 BUNNEN, JOEL, New North rd, Hoxton. June 3. Frederick Joel Bunker,
 Midway grove, Islington
 CARPENTER, JAMES, James Bridge, Darlaston, Railway Signalman. April 30.
 Arnold, Birmingham
 CAVENDISH, HENRY FREDERICK COMPTON, Stafford place, Piccadilly, Gent. May 10.
 Payne, Lansdowne place, Brunswick sq
 CLARKE, ANNA MARIA PRISCILLA HARE, Norwood, Surrey. May 15. Bowker
 and Co, Bedford row
 CLOUGH, THOMAS, Bury, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. May 18. Grundy, Bury
 COXON, JOHN, Freeford, near Lichfield, Farmer. May 31. Russell, Lichfield
 ELDER, WILLIAM, Whitburn, Durham, Gent. June 30. Walker, Sunderland
 ESTAUGH, MARY ANN, Romford, Essex. May 20. Hunt and Co, St Swithin's
 lane
 GASKELL, SAMUEL, Walton on Thames. May 29. Young and Co, Essex st, Strand
 GEDGE, WILLIAM, Brunswick place, Regent's park, Gent. June 2. Blachford
 and Co, Abchurch lane
 GOODING, WILLIAM, Washford, Old Cleve, Somerset, Retired Manure Merchant.
 May 6. Ponsford and Co, Barton, near Taunton
 HACKING, ROBERT, Cheetham, Lancaster, Publican. May 25. Welsh and Sons,
 Manchester
 HAYNES, JOHN GWILLIAM, Llanwrothal, Herefordshire, Farmer. April 30. Soobie,
 Hereford
 HICKS, JULIA, St Albans, Hertford. May 29. Jessopp and Son, Bedford
 HOCKERHULL, JOHN, Prescott, Lancaster, Butcher. June 1. Ansell and Eccles,
 St Helena
 HOLMES, ELIZABETH, Gee st, Euston sq. May 25. Allea and Son, Carlisle st,
 Soho sq
 HOYLE, THOMAS, South Shore, near Blackpool, Esq. May 25. Dickson, Black-
 pool
 JAMES, JANE PALMER, Dartington, near Totnes. May 15. Kelly and Wolferstan,
 Plymouth
 JOHNS, FREDERICK, Plymouth, Retired Superintendent Mercantile Marine. May
 15. Kelly and Wolferstan, Plymouth
 JOHNSTON, Major-General, WILLIAM WALKER WHITEHALL, Beaulieu rd,
 Hammersmith. June 1. Tarrant and Mackrell, Walbrook
 JURE, HANNAH, Batley, York. May 31. Scholfield and Taylor, Batley
 LADYMAN, WILLIAM, Preston, Lancaster, Solicitor. July 1. Walker and Co,
 Preston
 LLOYD, PRISCILLA, North st, Manchester sq. May 31. Kinsey and Co, Blooms-
 bury pl
 MATHEWS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Offord rd, Barnsbury. May 17. Behan, Chancery
 lane
 MOON, WILLIAM, Blackpool, Lancaster, Tailor. May 1. Banks, Blackpool
 NORTH, CHARLOTTE, Bracknell, Berks. May 19. Jukes, High st, Staines
 O'SHEA, ELIZABETH, Richmond, Surrey. May 15. Saunders and Co, Coleman st
 PAGE, JANE, Cotmandene, Dorking, Surrey. May 1. Hart and Co, Dorking
 PARKINSON, JOSEPH, Scholes, Cleckheaton, Gent. April 29. Farrar, Bradford
 PAYNE, WILLIAM, Leamington, Warwick. May 31. Field and Sons, Leamington
 RAWLINS, CHRISTOPHER, New York, U.S.A. June 9. Reed and Reed, Guildhall
 chambers
 RYE, HANNAH MARIA, Yard rd, Wandsworth. May 15. Webb and Burt, Argyl
 st, Regent st
 SANDERS, AMBROSE, Mickleham, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Hart and
 Co, Dorking
 TATTON, THOMAS WILLIAM, Wythenshawe, Chester, Esq. May 24. Lingards,
 Manchester
 WARD, JAMES KENDERDINE, Northfield, Worcester, Farmer. May 28. Tarleton
 and Butlin, Birmingham
 WREYMOUTH, HELEN ELIZABETH, St Aubyn's rd, Upper Norwood. May 17. Combs
 and Co, Bucklebury
 WILLIAMS, JOHN, Liverpool, Draper. May 13. Morecroft and Winstanley,
 Liverpool
 WOODROFFE, HENRY, Burton on Trent, Draper. May 31. Woodroffe, Gt Dover
 st, Southwark

[Gazette, April 13.]

DEATHS.

CLARENCE.—April 13, at Colombo, Blanche, wife of the Hon. Justice Clarence, of
 the Ceylon Supreme Court
 FITZADAM.—April 16, at 5, Phillimore-gardens, Kensington, John Thompson
 Fitzadam, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law and Recorder of Wigan
 TATHAM.—April 19, at West-hill, Highgate, John Lawrence Tatham, late of 6,
 New-square, Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law and Bench of the Hon. Society
 of Gray's-inn, aged 79.

FEE, TWO GUINEAS, for a sanitary inspection and report on a London dwelling-
 house. Country surveys by arrangement. The Sanitary Engineering and Ventila-
 tion Company, 115, Victoria-street, Westminster. Prospectus free.—[ADVT.]

FURNISH ON NORMAN & STACEY'S HIRE PURCHASE SYSTEM, 1, 2, or 3 years;
 the best system; 60 wholesale firms. Offices, 79, Queen Victoria-street E.C.
 Branches at 121, Pall Mall, S.W., and 9, Liverpool-street, E.C.—[ADVT.]

LONDON GAZETTES.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

FRIDAY, April 16, 1886.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

Appleyard, Abraham, Washington, Durham, Newsagent. Newcastle on Tyne.
 Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12. Exam Apr 29
 Armstrong, Charles, William Lambert Armstrong, and Tom Creighton,
 Carlisle, Builders, Carlisle. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 13. Exam Apr 28 at 11, at
 Court house, Carlisle
 Ashmore, Henry, Liverpool, Ironfounder. Liverpool. Pet Apr 2. Ord Apr
 14. Exam May 8 at 12, at Court house, Government buildings, Victoria st,
 Liverpool
 Ashworth, Walter, Leeds, Fish Salesman. Leeds. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12.
 Exam May 18 at 11
 Anty, Henry, Dewsbury, Yorks, Grocer. Dewsbury. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr 14.
 Exam May 4
 Belyea, Charles Allen, Charles Allen Belyea, jun., and George Albert Belyea,
 Liverpool, Shipowners. Liverpool. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12. Exam Apr 29
 at 11.30, at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Berrey, William Brough, Rainford, Lancashire, Miller. Liverpool. Pet Mar 27
 Ord Apr 13. Exam May 3 at 11, at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st,
 Liverpool
 Bown, Charles Henry Cullerne, Hammersmith, Provision Merchant. High
 Court. Pet Apr 8. Ord Apr 14. Exam May 26 at 11.30, at 34, Lincoln's
 inn fields
 Bownes, Thomas, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Innkeeper. Durham. Pet Apr 6
 Ord Apr 14. Exam May 4 at 2.30
 Callow, Thomas, Bristol, Baker. Bristol. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr 14. Exam May
 7 at 12, Guildhall, Bristol
 Clark, Edgar, Thomas, Greenwood road, Dalston, Furniture Dealer. High
 Court. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr 14. Exam May 26 at 11.30, at 34, Lincoln's
 inn fields
 Clarke, Thomas, Darfield, Grocer. Barnsley. Pet Apr 2. Ord Apr 14. Exam May
 27 at 11.30
 Clarkson, George, Princes End, Staffordshire, Forge Roller. Dudley. Pet Apr 8
 Ord Apr 8. Exam May 4 at 11
 Clegg, Josiah, Dewsbury, Yorks, Mill Foreman. Dewsbury. Pet Apr 13. Ord
 Apr 13. Exam May 4
 Collins, William John, Maple rd, Penge, Grocer. Croydon. Pet Apr 13. Ord
 Apr 12. Exam May 14
 Cook, W. B., Mount st. High Court. Pet Jan 29. Ord Apr 13. Exam May 26 at
 11.30, at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Cubitt, Amelia Jane, Lower Grosvenor place, Milliner. High Court. Pet Apr 6.
 Ord Apr 10. Exam May 19 at 12, at 34, Lincoln's inn field
 Edwards, James, Barrow in Furness, Boot Maker. Ulverston and Barrow in
 Furness. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12. Exam May 5 at 2.45, at Townhall, Barrow
 in Furness
 Elliott, Roscius, Leeds, Fishmonger. Leeds. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 13. Exam
 May 18 at 11
 Gamble, Robert, Scarborough, Builder. Scarborough. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 13
 Exam May 7 at 3
 Harrison, Leonard, Hoylake, Grocer. Birkenhead. Pet Apr 2. Ord Apr 14.
 Exam Apr 21
 Hawkins, Arthur Edwin, Runcorn, Clothier. Warrington. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr
 13. Exam May 6 at 2
 Hilder, John, Ecclesbourne, Surrey, no occupation. High Court. Pet Apr 14.
 Ord Apr 14. Exam May 28 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Howell, Henry, Wrexham, Denbighshire, Gas Fitter. Wrexham. Pet Apr 14.
 Ord Apr 14. Exam May 18
 Humphreys, W. J., Liverpool, Builder. Liverpool. Ord made under sec 103. Ord
 Apr 12. Exam Apr 29 at 12 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st,
 Liverpool
 Huntly, James Ballantine, Station rd, Forest Gate, Grocer. High Court. Pet
 Apr 14. Ord Apr 14. Exam May 28 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Joyce, Charles, Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, Shopkeeper. Northampton.
 Pet Apr 10. Ord Apr 10. Exam May 11
 Key, Aaron, Liverpool, Cattle Dealer. Liverpool. Pet Mar 25. Ord Apr 12.
 Exam Apr 29 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Leach, Francis, Wandsworth rd, Carman. Wandsworth. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr
 12. Exam May 20
 Marsh, John, Preston, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. Preston. Pet Apr 13.
 Ord Apr 13. Exam May 14
 McMicking, Gilbert, Ashford, Kent, Draper. Canterbury. Pet Apr 13. Ord
 Apr 14. Exam May 7
 Morrison, Charles, Newcastle on Tyne, Innkeeper. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Apr
 13. Ord Apr 13. Exam Apr 29
 Nicholls, William, Kidderminster, Beerhouse Keeper. Kidderminster. Pet Apr
 8. Ord Apr 8. Exam May 4 at 3 at Townhall, Kidderminster
 Nickson, William Robert, Leeds, Painter. Leeds. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12.
 Exam May 18 at 11
 Norris, Walter, High st, Kingsland, Printer. High Court. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr
 14. Exam May 20 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Nugent, Sir Charles, Wolsley, nr Stafford, Baronet. Stafford. Pet Mar 30. Ord
 Apr 12. Exam May 5 at 2 at Shirehall, Stafford
 Paxton, Henry, Bermoudsey, Tamper. High Court. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 13.
 Exam May 27 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Putwain, Charles, and Francis Homersham Putwain, Whitstable, Mineral Water
 Manufacturers. Canterbury. Pet Apr 9. Ord Apr 10. Exam May 7
 Ratcliffe, Richard Higgins, Birkdale, Lancashire, Gentleman. Liverpool. Pet
 Apr 5. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 3 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs,
 Victoria st, Liverpool
 Reid, George, Newcastle on Tyne, Merchant. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 9.
 Ord Apr 13. Exam Apr 29
 Satchell, Joseph, Lambeth walk, Lambeth, Oilman. High Court. Pet Apr 12.
 Ord Apr 12. Exam May 18 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Stevens, George, Ramsgate, Block Maker. Canterbury. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr
 14. Exam May 7
 Thompson, Charles, Trannore, Clerk. Birkenhead. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 13.
 Exam Apr 21
 Tisdale, James, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Gt Grimsby. Pet Apr 9.
 Ord Apr 9. Exam Apr 28 at 11 at Townhall, Grimsby
 Tyson, Joseph, Levens, Westmorland, Coachman. Kendal. Pet Apr 13. Ord
 Apr 13. Exam May 1 at 2 at Court house, Townhall, Kendal
 Walker, George, Bristol, Boot Dealer. Bristol. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 14. Exam
 May 7 at 12 at Guildhall, Bristol
 Williams, Philip, Aberaman, nr Aberdare, Grocer. Aberdare. Pet Apr 13. Ord
 Apr 12. Exam May 3 at 10.30 at Temperance Hall, Aberdare
 Wilson, Benjamin, and John Wilson, Dewsbury, Yorks, Farmers. Dewsbury.
 Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr 14. Exam May 4
 Withers, Henry Cooke, Norwich, Drysalter. Norwich. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr
 12. Exam Apr 28 at 12 at Shirehall, Norwich Castle
 Woolf, Charles Morris, Manchester st, Manchester sq, no occupation. High
 Court. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12. Exam May 18 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Yates, Thomas, Birmingham, Boot Dealer. Birmingham. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr
 14. Exam May 11 at 2

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Mar 30.
Bilbrough, George, Hackney rd, Ironmonger. High Court. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam May 5 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

Everett, John Frederick, Brighton, no occupation. High Court. Receiving ord Dec 15. Resc'd Apr 10

FIRST MEETINGS.

Appleyard, Abraham, Washington, Durham, News Agent. Apr 28 at 12. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
Armstrong, Charles, William Lambert Armstrong, and Tom Creighton, Carlisle, Builders. Apr 28 at 2. Official Receiver, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
Arundel, Thomas, Hatfield, Yorks, Farmer. Apr 28 at 12.30. Official Receiver, Figtrees lane, Sheffield
Atkins, John, Bucknall Torkard, Nottinghamshire, Beerseller. Apr 23 at 12. Official Receiver, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
Baylis, Francis, Fazeley, Staffordshire, Butcher. Apr 29 at 11. Official Receiver, Birmingham
Bennell, Angelo Jethro Archibald, Sydenham, Provision Dealer. Apr 29 at 3. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster
Bradford, George, Broadstairs, Licensed Victualler. Apr 24 at 10.45. 32, St. George's st, Canterbury
Bradford, Robert, Walcot, Lincolnshire, Farmer. May 6 at 12. Official Receiver, 48, High st, Boston
Brettell, Edward Nock, West Bromwich, Staffordshire, Retail Brewer. May 3 at 10.15. Court house, Oldbury
Cordeux, John, Hunslet, Leeds, Tanner. Apr 29 at 11. Official Receiver, St. Andrew's chhrs, 22, Park row, Leeds
Danson, Henry Richard Cobden, Liverpool, Solicitor. Apr 30 at 3. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
Elgie, Hannah Margaret, Stockton on Tees, Wine Dealer. Apr 29 at 11. Official Receiver, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
Gange, Richard Quick, Fownhope, Herefordshire, Land Agent. Apr 28 at 10.30. Official Receiver, 2, Offa st, Hereford
Harwood, Thomas, West Bromwich, out of business. May 10 at 10. Court house, Oldbury
Hawkins, Arthur Edwin, Runcorn, Clothier. Apr 28 at 10.30. Official Receiver, Cairo st, Warrington
Hargrave, James, Tardy Gate, nr Preston, Grocer. Apr 27 at 3. Official Receiver, 14, Chapel st, Preston
Hughes, Arthur, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, Harness Maker. Apr 29 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 1, St. Aldate's, Oxford
Jones, James, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. Apr 30 at 11. Official Receiver, Birmingham
Joyce, Charles, Newport Pagnel, Buckinghamshire, Shopkeeper. Apr 24 at 3. County court, Northampton
Kenning, Thomas, Liverpool, Boot Maker. Apr 28 at 3. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
Lake, Thomas, Reevesby, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Apr 29 at 12.30. Official Receiver, 2, St. Benedict's sq, Lincoln
Long, William Fairer, Witney, Oxfordshire, Auctioneer. Apr 30 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 1, St. Aldate's, Oxford
McMicking, Gilbert, Ashford, Kent, Draper. Apr 28 at 3. Official Receiver, 11, Bank st, Ashford
Morrison, Charles, Newcastle on Tyne, Innkeeper. Apr 28 at 11. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
Putwain, Charles, and Francis Homersham Putwain, Whitstable, Mineral Water Manufacturers. Apr 24 at 10. 32, St. George's st, Canterbury
Reid, George, Newcastle on Tyne, Merchant. Apr 28 at 2.30. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
Thomson, William Thomas, Stourport, Grease Manufacturer. May 3 at 10.45. Court house, Oldbury
Twidale, James, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Apr 29 at 11. King's Head Hotel, Louth
Vivian, Mary, Camborne, Cornwall, Draper. Apr 24 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Boscawen st, Truro
Wakeford, Thomas, Liss, nr Petersfield, Hants, Butcher. May 3 at 3. Official Receiver, 166, Queen st, Portsea
Williams, Philip, Aberaman, nr Aberdare, Grocer. Apr 24 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil
Williams, Richard, Benarth Farm, nr Conway, Farmer. Apr 30 at 12. Queen's Head Cafe, Bangor
Woodall, John, Oldbury, Worcestershire, Beerhouse Keeper. May 3 at 10.30. Court house, Oldbury

ADJUDICATIONS.

Arundel, Thomas, Hatfield, Yorks, Farmer. Sheffield. Pet Mar 24. Ord Apr 12
Ashworth, Walter, Leeds, Fish Salesman. Leeds. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 13
Axford, John Barnabas, Henry st, Gray's inn, Builder. High Court. Pet Mar 31. Ord Apr 14
Bellaers, James, Oxford st, Stepney, Doctor of Medicine. High Court. Pet Mar 15. Ord Apr 13
Bewick, Joseph, Sunderland, Packing Case Manufacturer. Sunderland. Pet Mar 13. Ord Apr 14
Bosley, James, Hurley, Berks, Brickmaker. Reading. Pet Mar 16. Ord Apr 13
Bowness, Thomas, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Innkeeper. Durham. Pet Apr 6. Ord Apr 14
Bunting, James, Walsall, House Decorator. Walsall. Pet Mar 24. Ord Apr 14
Campbell, John McGregor, Glengall rd, Old Kent rd, Coal Merchant. High Court. Pet Mar 19. Ord Apr 10
Chambers, Alfred, Exeter, Poulterer. Exeter. Pet Mar 22. Ord Apr 10
Conlon, Squire, Bramley, Yorks, Woollen Waste Dealer. Leeds. Pet Apr 10. Ord Apr 10
Crump, Alexander Benjamin, Westbury on Severn, Gloucestershire, Farmer. Gloucester. Pet Mar 29. Ord Apr 13
Cutbill, John James, Waterloo Bridge rd, Ironmonger. High Court. Pet Feb 26. Ord Apr 14
Dennis, Joseph, Lincoln, Hairdresser. Lincoln. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 18
Dymond, W., Water lane, Wine Merchant. High Court. Pet Jan 28. Ord Apr 12
Elliott, Roscius, Leeds, Fishmonger. Leeds. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 14
Elves, Charles Edward, Commercial rd, Lead Merchant. High Court. Pet Jan 14. Ord Apr 12
Fairhead, Thomas James, Walthamstow, Builder. High Court. Pet Mar 18. Ord Apr 14
Fawdry, Thomas, Birmingham, Corn Factor. Birmingham. Pet Mar 18. Ord Apr 14
Forwood, Charles Brittain, New Quay, Liverpool, Shipbroker. Liverpool. Pet Mar 26. Ord Apr 14
Gange, Richard Quick, Fownhope, Herefordshire, Land Agent. Hereford. Pet Mar 5. Ord Apr 12
Gard, George, Crawley, Sussex, General Shop Keeper. Brighton. Pet Mar 26. Ord Apr 14
Green, William, Ipswich, Hatter. Ipswich. Pet Apr 7. Ord Apr 12
Harding, Edward, Bridgend, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Cardiff. Pet Apr 2. Ord Apr 12
Hardy, Stanley, Haymarket, Stock Broker. High Court. Pet Mar 19. Ord Apr 12
Hellbron, Joseph, Lancaster rd, Notting Hill, Traveller. High Court. Pet Apr 9. Ord Apr 13

Jones, Jacob Nathaniel, address unknown, Solicitor. High Court. Pet Apr 9. Ord Apr 12
Lambert, George, and Edwin Lambert, Horamonden, Kent, Millers. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Mar 10. Ord Apr 8
Lovelock, Mary Jane, Snelmore, Berks, Widow. Newbury. Pet Mar 4. Ord Apr 13
Marsh John, Preston, Licensed Victualler. Preston. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 14
Marriott, Fred, Birstal, Yorks, Woollen Manufacturer. Dewsbury. Pet Mar 26. Ord Apr 14
Miles, Michael, Brighton, Butcher. Brighton. Pet Apr 9. Ord Apr 14
Moore, Henry, Honley, Yorks, Innkeeper. Huddersfield. Pet Mar 29. Ord Apr 13
Morrison, Charles, Newcastle on Tyne, Innkeeper. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12
Nasington, Edmund Cox, Dudley, Worcestershire, Pork Butcher. Pet Mar 15. Ord Apr 10
Nicholls, William, Kidderminster, Beerhouse Keeper. Kidderminster. Pet Apr 8. Ord Apr 10
Nickson, William Robert, Briggate, Leeds, Painter. Leeds. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 13
Payne, George Henry, and Allen Courtney, Fenchurch st, Shipbrokers. High Court. Pet Feb 16. Ord Apr 12
Peacock, John Guest, Birmingham, Carpenter. Birmingham. Pet Apr 8. Ord Apr 10
Redden, Alfred James, Northampton, Bootmaker. Northampton. Pet Mar 10. Ord Apr 10
Redington, Frederick, Oxford, Hotel Keeper. Oxford. Pet Mar 18. Ord Apr 12
Richardson, Hannah Lee, Dewsbury, Yorks, Woollen Maker. Dewsbury. Pet Mar 23. Ord Apr 13
Satchell, Joseph, Lambeth walk, Lambeth, Olman. High Court. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 12
Sawyer, Harry, Lamberhurst, Kent, Grocer. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Mar 1. Ord Apr 13
Shakespeare, William Carey, Netherseal, Leicestershire, Farmer. Burton-on-Trent. Pet Mar 23. Ord Apr 14
Smith, John Bussey, Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, Commission Agent. Lincoln. Pet Apr 1. Ord Apr 1
Stone, Richard, sen, Marcham, Berks, Farmer. Oxford. Pet Mar 22. Ord Apr 10
Turner, Richard Douglas, Andover, Brewer's Assistant. Salisbury. Pet Apr 3. Ord Apr 12
Taylor, Richard, Ramabottom, Lancs, Clogger. Bolton. Pet Mar 16. Ord Apr 13
Taylor, Thomas, Uttoxeter, Staffs, Wheelwright. Burton on Trent. Pet Mar 12. Ord Apr 14
Taylor, Walter Arthur, Brigg, Lincolnshire, Clerk in Holy Orders. Gt Grimsby. Pet Mar 4. Ord Apr 12
Thomas, William, Cardiff, Seedsman. Cardiff. Pet Mar 8. Ord Apr 5
Thomson, George, Wolverhampton, Grocer. Wolverhampton. Pet Apr 9. Ord Apr 12
Twist, James, and William Twist, Southport, Auctioneers. Liverpool. Pet Mar 5 and 18, consolidated Mar 30. Ord Apr 14
Waters, Arthur Bartholomew, Brighton, Grocer. Brighton. Pet Mar 25. Ord Apr 12
Williams, Richard, Benarth Farm, nr Conway, Farmer. Bangor. Pet Apr 3. Ord Apr 12
Woodham, Henry, Hungerford, Watchmaker. Newbury. Pet Mar 23. Ord Apr 12
Yates, Thomas, Birmingham, Boot Dealer. Birmingham. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr 14

ADJUDICATIONS ANNULLED.

Wickham, Thomas Provis, Brighton, Gent. Brighton. Adjud July 30. Annul Apr 9
Morgan, David, Riverhead, Sevenoaks, Stone Quarryman. Tunbridge Wells. Adjud Feb 24. Annul Apr 8

TUESDAY, April 20, 1886.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

Adamson, William Francis, York, Lithographer. York. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17
17. Exam May 21 at 11 at Guildhall, York
Barker, James, Rochdale, Lancashire, Agent. Oldham. Pet Apr 16. Ord Apr 17
17. Exam May 18 at 11.30
Blackburn, William, Sutton on the Forest, Bricklayer. York. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 21 at 11 at Guildhall, York
Charnock, John, Liverpool, out of business. Liverpool. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 3 at 12 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool
Dixon, Alfred Dodgshun, and Sydney Dixon, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturers. Leeds. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17
17. Exam May 18 at 11
Earp, Joseph Guest, Birmingham, Oil Merchant. Birmingham. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 17 at 2
Easton, Edward, Delahay st, Engineer. High Court. Pet Dec 24. Ord Apr 11
11. Exam May 26 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Gillard, Samuel, Crediton, Devon, Baker. Exeter. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 13 at 11
Golden, James, and George Chapman, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Engineers. King's Lynn. Pet Apr 16. Ord Apr 16
16. Exam May 14 at 10.30 at Court house, London rd, King's Lynn
Gregory, Charles, Hincley, Leicestershire, Baker. Leicester. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 5 at 10
Green, Frederick John, Royal hill, Greenwich, Solicitor. Greenwich. Pet Apr 16. Ord Apr 16
16. Exam May 21 at 1
Greenwood, David, Handsworth, Staffordshire, Builder. Birmingham. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 14
14. Exam May 14
Heptonstall, Joseph Henry, Leeds, out of business. Leeds. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 18 at 11
Herschell, Moritz, Liverpool, General Merchant. Liverpool. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 6 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool
Hirst, Sydney, Beeston, nr Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. Leeds. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 18 at 11
Judd, Thomas Albert, Surbiton, Saddler. Kingston, Surrey. Pet Apr 6. Ord Apr 6
6. Exam May 7 at 3.30
Leney, George Coombs, Hastings, Fancy Dealer. Hastings. Pet Apr 13. Ord Apr 13
13. Exam May 24
Leney, Lord Henry Gordon, Prince's gate. High Court. Pet Aug 6. Ord Feb 26
26. Exam May 27 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Livingstone, John, Pontypriid, Carriage Builder. Pontypriid. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 16
16. Exam May 4 at 2
McPherson, John Robert, Sumner rd, Camberwell, Dairyman. High Court. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 16
16. Exam May 26 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Mead, Elizabeth, Worthing, Saddler. Brighton. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15
15. Exam May 13 at 11
Miles, William, Fenton, Staffordshire, out of employment. Stoke upon Trent and Longton. Pet Apr 14. Ord Apr 14
14. Exam May 6 at 11.15
Moffat, James Gordon, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17
17. Exam May 4
Moore, Edward, Wolverhampton, Baker. Wolverhampton. Pet Apr 10. Ord Apr 16
16. Exam May 17
Parke, John, Bristol, Draper. Bristol. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17
17. Exam May 21 at 12 at Guildhall, Bristol
Pavey, Richard Hall, Manchester, Furrier. Manchester. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17
17. Exam May 6 at 2

Pitt, Henry Alfred, Willesden green, no occupation. High Court. Pet Mar 31.
 Ord Apr 17. Exam May 27 at 12.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Price, John Edward, Bedford rd, Russell sq, Journalist. High Court. Pet Mar
 17. Ord Apr 17. Exam May 27 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
 Pringle, Catharine Wilson, Hove, Sussex, Schoolmistress. Brighton. Pet Apr
 14. Ord Apr 15. Exam May 13 at 11
 Radford, S. H., Wandsworth rd, Horse Dealer. Wandsworth. Pet Mar 15.
 Ord Apr 15. Exam May 20
 Rigby, David, Great Barr, Staffordshire, Coach Axle Manufacturer. Oldbury.
 Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15. Exam May 24
 Shepherd, Aaron, Bradford, Stuff Finisher. Bradford. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr
 15. Exam May 4
 Simpson, John George Povey, Preston, Lancashire, out of business. Preston.
 Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17. Exam May 21
 Thompson, Joseph, Jarrow, Durham, Builder. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Apr 10.
 Ord Apr 15. Exam May 4
 Thornaby, Christopher, Sheffield, no occupation. Sheffield. Pet Feb 27. Ord
 Apr 15. Exam Apr 29 at 11.30
 Topp, Anthony Mann, Girdler's rd, West Kensington, Clerk in Holy Orders.
 High Court. Pet Mar 25. Ord Apr 15. Exam May 25 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's
 inn fields
 Wade, Joseph, Walsall, Grocer. Walsall. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15. Exam
 May 3
 Wich, Frank, Cheltenham, Commercial Traveller. Cheltenham. Pet Apr 17.
 Ord Apr 17. Exam May 5 at 11
 Williams, Hugh, Llanberis, Carnarvonshire, General Dealer. Bangor. Pet Apr
 15. Ord Apr 15. Exam May 13 at 11 at Court house, Bangor
 Williams, William Elvion, Pennant, Montgomeryshire, Draper. Newtown. Pet
 Apr 15. Ord Apr 15. Exam Apr 28

FIRST MEETINGS.

Adamson, William Francis, York, Lithographer. Apr 29 at 2. Official Receiver,
 17, Blake st, York
 Ashmore, Henry, Liverpool, Iron Founder. May 4 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 35,
 Victoria st, Liverpool
 Ashworth, Walter, Leeds, Fish Salesman. Apr 29 at 3. St Andrew's chbrs, 22,
 Park row, Leeds
 Awhery, David, Reading, Grocer. Apr 29 at 12.30. Official Receiver, 100, Victoria
 st, Westminster
 Barker, James, Rochdale, Lancashire, Agent. Apr 30 at 3.30. Townhall, Roch-
 dale
 Berrey, William Brough, Rainford, Lancashire, Miller. May 4 at 3. Official Re-
 ceiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Bilbrough, George, Hackney rd, Ironmonger. May 4 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lin-
 coln's inn fields
 Blackburn, William, Sutton on the Forest, Yorks, Bricklayer. Apr 29 at 12.
 Official Receiver, York
 Blenkhorn, Alexander Charles, Deptford, Grocer. Apr 30 at 12. Official Receiver,
 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 Bowness, Thomas, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Innkeeper. Apr 30 at 3. Com-
 mercial Hotel, Bishop Auckland
 Cellow, Thomas, Bristol, Baker. Apr 29 at 12.45. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs,
 Bristol
 Cane, Thomas, Burgess Hill, Sussex, Manufacturer. May 7 at 11. 33, Carey st,
 Lincoln's inn fields
 Charnley, John, Tue Brook, nr Liverpool, out of business. May 4 at 2.30. Official
 Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Clark, Elizabeth, Regent st, Dressmaker. May 6 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's
 inn fields
 Clarke, Thomas, Low Valley, Darfield, Grocer. Apr 29 at 10. Official Receiver,
 3, Eastgate, Barnsley
 Collens, William John, Maple rd, Penge, Grocer. May 3 at 12. Official Receiver,
 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 Drew, George Bernard Harvey, Bermondsey st, Solicitor. May 5 at 2. Bank-
 ruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Dunn, Robert, Kingsland rd, Lithographer. May 12 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs,
 Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Edwards, James, Barrow in Furness, Bootmaker. May 5 at 12. Official Receiver,
 2, Paxton terr, Barrow in Furness
 Elliott, Roscius, Leeds, Fishmonger. Apr 30 at 12. St Andrew's chbrs, 22,
 Park row, Leeds
 Evans, Thomas, Littlemore, Oxfordshire, Schoolmaster. May 1 at 11.30. Official
 Receiver, 1, St Aldate's, Oxford
 Fanta, Ferdinand, Shoe lane. May 6 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lin-
 coln's inn fields
 Forder, Frederick, Gt Yarmouth, Cabinet Maker. Apr 27 at 1. Official Receiver,
 8, King st, Norwich
 Gamble, Robert, Scarborough, Builder. Apr 30 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 74,
 Newborough st, Scarborough
 Gann, Joseph Horlock, Holborn Viaduct, Agent for Bicycle Manufacturers.
 May 12 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Gillard, Samuel, Crediton, Devon, Baker. Apr 29 at 11. Castle of Exeter, at
 Exeter
 Gilman, Alfred, Lennox rd, Finsbury Park, Builder. May 13 at 12. 33, Carey st,
 Lincoln's inn fields
 Goodbun, William Henry, Dogburst, Harlington, Gent. May 3 at 3. Official
 Receiver, 100, Victoria st, Westminster
 Greenep, Edmund G., Stratford, Essex, Solicitor. May 13 at 11. Bankruptcy
 bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Gregory, Charles, Hinckley, Leicestershire, Baker. Apr 29 at 12.30. Official Re-
 ceiver, 25, Friar lane, Leicester
 Hampton, James, West Bromwich, Retail Brewer. May 17 at 10.30. Court
 house, Oldbury
 Herd, Charles, Egham, Surrey, Boot Maker. Apr 30 at 1. 29 and 29, St Swithin's
 lane
 Howell, Henry, Wrexham, Denbighshire, Gasfitter. Apr 28 at 2.30. Wynnstay
 Arms Hotel, Wrexham
 Humphreys, W. J., Liverpool, Builder. Apr 30 at 12. Official Receiver, 35, Vic-
 toria st, Liverpool
 Jones, William, Ilfracombe, Builder. Apr 29 at 2. George Otton, the Strand,
 Barnstaple
 Judd, Thomas Albert, Surbiton, Harness Maker. Apr 29 at 11. 29 and 29, St
 Swithin's lane
 King, Walter, Cochrane st, St John's Wood, Coachbuilder. May 7 at 2. 33,
 Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Leney, George Coombs, Hastings, Fancy Dealer. Apr 29 at 12. Bankruptcy
 bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Levy, Samuel, Brick lane, Spitalfields, Carman. May 12 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lin-
 coln's inn fields
 Livingstone, John, Pontypriid, Carriage Builder. Apr 29 at 12. Official Receiver,
 Merthyr Tydfil
 Marsh, John, Preston, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. Apr 27 at 2. Official
 Receiver, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 Mead, Elizabeth, Worthing, Saddle Maker. Apr 28 at 12. Official Receiver, 39,
 Bond st, Brighton
 Meyer, Montague, and Ernest Morris, Aldersgate st, Furriers. May 7 at 11.
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Mills, William, Fenton, Staffordshire, no occupation. May 6 at 10.15. Official
 Receiver, Newcastle under Lyme
 Moffat, James Gordon, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer. May 1 at 11. Official Re-
 ceiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne

Moore, Edward, Wolverhampton, Baker. Apr 30 at 4. Official Receiver, St.
 Peter's close, Wolverhampton
 Morris, Moss, Stratford, Essex, Furniture Dealer. May 12 at 11. Bankruptcy
 bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Munday, Edward James, Sheffield, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. May 3 at 12.30.
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Nickson, William Robert, Briggate, Leeds, Painter. Apr 29 at 12. St. Andrew's
 chbrs, 22, Park row, Leeds
 Oxlade, James, jun., High Wycombe, Chair Manufacturer. May 5 at 11.30. Official
 Receiver, 1, St Aldate's, Oxford
 Park, Joseph, St Helens, Lancashire, Grocer. Apr 28 at 12. Official Receiver, 35,
 Victoria st, Liverpool
 Peacock, John Guest, Birmingham, Carpenter. May 5 at 11. Official Receiver,
 Birmingham
 Phipps, Edward Henry Patrick, Cambridge, Gloucestershire, Gentleman. May
 1 at 3. Official Receiver, Gloucester
 Pringle, Catharine Wilson, Hove, Sussex, Schoolmistress. Apr 28 at 2.30. Official
 Receiver, 39, Bond st, Brighton
 Ratcliffe, Richard Higgins, Birkdale, Lancashire, Gentleman. May 4 at 12.30.
 Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Roodhouse, Samuel, Leeds, Pickle Manufacturer. Apr 30 at 11. St Andrew's
 chbrs, 22, Park row, Leeds
 Shepherd, Aaron, Bradford, Stuff Finisher. Apr 29 at 11. Official Receiver, 31
 Manor rd, Bradford
 Simpson, Charles, Birkbeck avenue, Horn lane, Acton, Carpenter. Apr 29 at 12.
 29 and 29, St Swithin's lane
 Sly, George Warren, Greenwich, Builder. Apr 30 at 3. Official Receiver, 109,
 Victoria st, Westminster
 Solly, Henry Ernest, Mile End, Forage Merchant. May 10 at 12. 33, Carey st,
 Lincoln inn fields
 Stephens, Thomas, West Bromwich, Beerhouse Keeper. May 10 at 10.30. Court
 House, Oldbury
 Taylor, Thomas, East Boldon, Durham, Housebuilder. Apr 28 at 11. Law
 Society, 32, John st, Sunderland
 Thompson, Charles, Tranmere, Clerk. Apr 30 at 1. Official Receiver, 48
 Hamilton sq, Birkenhead
 Thompson, Joseph, Jarrow, Durham, Builder. May 4 at 2.30. Official Receiver
 Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 Thornaby, Christopher, Sheffield, no occupation. Apr 28 at 2. Official Receiver
 Fig tree lane, Sheffield
 Turner, Theophilus Verney, Gwendyr rd, Kensington, Gent. May 6 at 11. Bank-
 ruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Tyson, Joseph, Levens, Westmorland, Coachman. May 1 at 12. Official Re-
 ceiver, 37, Stramontage, Kendal
 Wade, Joseph, Walsall, Grocer. Apr 29 at 11. Official Receiver, Bridge street,
 Walsall
 Walker, George, Bristol, Boot Dealer. Apr 29 at 3. Official Receiver, Bank
 chbrs, Bristol
 Whistler, Charles, Landridge rd, Fulham, Merchant's Clerk. May 7 at 12. Bank-
 ruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Williams, William Elvion, Pennant, Mont., Draper. Apr 28 at 1. Elephant
 Hotel, Newtown
 Withers, Henry Cooke, Norwich, Drysalter. Apr 27 at 3. Official Receiver, 8,
 King st, Norwich

ADJUDICATIONS.

Appleyard, Abraham, Washington, Durham, Newsagent. Newcastle on Tyne.
 Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 17
 Armstrong, William, and John Walsley, Bury, Hat Manufacturers. Bolton.
 Pet Mar 19. Ord Apr 15
 Ashby, George Andrew, Luton, Bedfordshire, Builder. Luton. Pet Mar 21.
 Ord Apr 17
 Ashton, George, Bridge rd West, Battersea, Corn Dealer. Wandsworth. Pet
 Mar 30. Ord Apr 13
 Barlow, John, Manchester, Sand Rock Merchant. Manchester. Pet Mar 22.
 Bedford, Walter, Bradford, Plumber. Bradford. Pet Apr 1. Ord Apr 15
 Brailsford, Robert, Walcot, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Boston. Pet Mar 22. Ord
 Apr 15
 Clarkson, George, Prince's End, Staffordshire, Forge Roller. Dudley. Pet Apr
 8. Ord Apr 15
 Clegg, Edward, Nelson, Lancashire, Draper. Burnley. Pet Apr 1. Ord
 Apr 15
 Corey, Reinald, Lillington rd, Anerley. Croydon. Pet Mar 5. Ord Apr 15
 Davies, Samuel, Porth, Glamorganshire, Bootmaker. Pontypriid. Pet Jan 18.
 Ord Jan 20
 Dewhurst, William, Market st, Lancaster, Draper. Preston. Pet Apr 2. Ord
 Apr 17
 Dunn, Robert, Kingsland rd, Lithographer. High Court. Pet Apr 3. Ord
 Apr 15
 Earp, Joseph Guest, Birmingham, Oil Merchant. Birmingham. Pet Apr 15.
 Ord Apr 15
 Fenn, Louisa, Little Walsingham, Norfolk, Grocer. Norwich. Pet Apr 5. Ord
 Apr 15
 Flak, William, Gorleston, Suffolk, no occupation. Great Yarmouth. Pet Apr 5.
 Ord Apr 15
 Forrester, William, Dover, Coal Merchant. Canterbury. Pet Apr 5. Ord
 Apr 15
 George, John Irving, Wigton, Cumberland, Chemist. Carlisle. Pet Apr 2.
 Ord Apr 15
 Goble, Frederick, Ferrers rd, Streatham, Grocer's Assistant. Wandsworth. Pet
 Mar 25. Ord Apr 15
 Goldsmid, Michael Joseph, Clerkenwell rd, Jeweller. High Court. Pet Feb 9.
 Ord Apr 15
 Grant, William Charles, Parana terr, Holmesdale rd, South Norwood, Grocer.
 Croydon. Pet Mar 22. Ord Apr 15
 Gray, Mary, and Emma Gray, Leicester, Drapers. Leicester. Pet Mar 9. Ord
 Apr 15
 Gray, Tom, Leicester, Watchmaker. Leicester. Pet Mar 9. Ord Apr 13
 Griffiths, Evan, Trallong, Brecknockshire, Farmer. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet Apr 2.
 Ord Apr 15
 Harvey, Joseph Hensel, Newcastle on Tyne, Provision Broker. Newcastle on
 Tyne. Pet Mar 27. Ord Apr 17
 Heyward, William, Birmingham, Hat Manufacturer. Birmingham. Pet Apr 1.
 Ord Apr 15
 Heath, Thomas, Leicester, Timber Merchant. Leicester. Pet Mar 5. Ord
 Apr 9
 Heptonstall, Joseph Henry, Leeds, out of business. Leeds. Pet Apr 15. Ord
 Apr 16
 Hime, Harry Edward, Llanrwst, Denbighshire, Artist. Bangor. Pet Mar 31.
 Ord Apr 15
 Hirst, Sydney, Beeston, nr Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. Leeds. Pet Apr 15.
 Ord Apr 15
 Holcooke, William, Marylebone rd, Artist. High Court. Pet Mar 12. Ord
 Apr 15
 Jones, William, Ilfracombe, Builder. Barnstaple. Pet Apr 2. Ord Apr 16
 Judd, Thomas Albert, Surbiton, Saddler. Kingston, Surrey. Pet Apr 6. Ord
 Apr 16
 King, Arthur Charles, Winchester, Hairdresser. Winchester. Pet Mar 22. Ord
 Apr 15

Lake, Thomas, Revesby, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Lincoln. Pet Apr 5. Ord Apr 15.
 Lewis, David, Neath, Glamorganshire, Plumber. Neath. Pet Apr 1. Ord Apr 15.
 Livingstone, John, Pontypidd, Carriage Builder. Pontypidd. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 17.
 Loveday, John, Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire, Auctioneer. Leicester. Pet Mar 5. Ord Apr 16.
 Lucking, Henry John Lockwood, Leytonstone, Cheesemonger. High Court. Pet Mar 23. Ord Apr 15.
 Mowbray, Richard Butler, Audlem, Cheshire, out of business. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Mar 25. Ord Apr 16.
 Moxey, William Pike, Lowestoft, Suffolk, out of business. Gt. Yarmouth. Pet Apr 2. Ord Apr 15.
 Phipps, Edward Henry Patrick, Cambridge, Gloucestershire, Gentleman. Gloucester. Pet Apr 10. Ord Apr 16.
 Rogers, Alfred, East Dereham, Bootmaker. Norwich. Pet Apr 7. Ord Apr 8.
 Roodhouse, Samuel, Leeds, Pickle Manufacturer. Leeds. Pet Apr 9. Ord Apr 15.
 Seaton, Sarah, Exeter, Boot Dealer. Exeter. Pet Mar 29. Ord Apr 16.
 Shepherd, Aaron, Gillington, Bradford, Stuff Finisher. Bradford. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15.
 Smith, Samuel Kerrison, Bradwell, Suffolk, Farmer. Gt. Yarmouth. Pet Mar 15. Ord Apr 17.
 Sultsberger, Hartmann, Henry, Penge, out of business. Croydon. Pet Mar 17. Ord Apr 15.
 Tantum, Selina, and William Tantum, Birmingham, Pawnbrokers. Birmingham. Pet Mar 18. Ord Apr 17.
 Thompson, Charles, Traummere, Clerk. Birkenhead. Pet Apr 18. Ord Apr 16.
 Trevasaki, John, Maindee, nr Newport, Mon., Bootmaker. Newport, Mon. Pet Apr 1. Ord Apr 16.
 Veriot, James George, Salisbury, Grocer. Salisbury. Pet Mar 22. Ord Apr 16.
 Wade, Joseph, Walsall, Grocer. Walsall. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 15.
 Walker, George, Bristol, Book Dealer. Bristol. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 17.
 Williams, Lydia Elizabeth, Newcastle on Tyne, Licensed Victualler. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Apr 3. Ord Apr 15.
 Williams, Philip, Aberaman, nr Aberdare, Grocer. Aberdare. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 14.
 Woolf, Charles Morris, Manchester st, Manchester sq, no occupation. High Court. Pet Apr 12. Ord Apr 15.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Feb 19.
 Dovey, Edward, Birmingham, Saw Mill Proprietor. Birmingham. Pet Feb 12. Ord Feb 17.
 ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.
 Furtwangler, Andreas, Strand, Watch Maker. High Court. Adjud Feb 4. Annul Apr 14.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advances includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volume, bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS	415	BANKRUPTCY CASES:—	
LABEL BY A HUSBAND ON HIS WIFE	416	Ex parte Stanford, Re Barber ..	416
THE CROWN OFFICE RULES, 1886	417	CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS:—	
CASES OF THE WEEK:—		Re Robert Dundas Strong (a Solicitor)	419
Jeuner-Fust v. Needham	418	Re Emanuel and Simmonds	420
Higgins v. Kirkpatrick	418	SOCIETIES	420
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE:—		LEGAL APPOINTMENTS	421
Re Ord, Pengeley v. Herbert	418	COURT PAPERS	421
Re The Sheffield Wagon Co. (Limited)	418	COMPANIES	422
Marriott v. Chamberlain	418	CREDITORS' CLAIMS	423
		LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c.	423

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.
 Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.
 Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA & LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 6s., 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietor.

H. SCHWEITZER & Co., 10, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.C.

ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL SCHOOL, Hyde-park-corner, S.W.—The SUMMER SESSION will COMMENCE on SATURDAY, MAY 1.

The Competitions for the William Brown £100 Exhibition will take place in July.

The following Entrance Scholarships will be offered for competition in October.

1. A Scholarship, value £125, for the sons of medical men who have entered the School during the current year. 2. Two Scholarships, each of £40, open to all Students commencing their studies. The subjects for these three Scholarships will be Latin, French or German, and Elementary Physics, and the Examination will be held on Monday, Oct. 4th.

3. A Scholarship, value £90, open to all students who have entered the School during the current year, and who have passed the Cambridge First M.B. since October, 1884. Subjects—Elementary Biology, Anatomy, Physiology, and Practical Chemistry. 4. A Scholarship, value £75, for students who have entered during the current year, and have passed the Oxford First M.B. or the Cambridge Second M.B. Subjects—Anatomy and Physiology. The Examination for these Scholarships will be held during the month of October.

The following Exhibitions and Prizes are also open to students:—The William Brown £100 Exhibition, the William Brown £40 Exhibition, the Brackenbury Prize in Medicine, value £33, the Brackenbury Prize in Surgery, value £33, the Pollock Prize in Physiology, value £15, the Johnson Prize in Anatomy, value £10 10s., the Treasurer's Prize, value £10 10s. General Proficiency Prizes for first, second, and third year students of £10 10s. each, the Brodie Prize in Surgery, the Acland Prize in Medicine, the Thompson Medal, and Sir Charles Clarke's Prize.

All Hospital appointments, including the two House Physicianships and two House Surgeonships, are awarded as the result of competition, and are open to the Students without additional expense of any kind.

Clerkships and Dresserships, and all the minor appointments are given without extra fees. Several paid appointments, including that of Obstetric Assistant, with a salary of £100 and board and lodging, are awarded yearly upon the recommendation of the Medical School Committee.

Prospectuses and fuller details may be obtained by application to

WILLIAM WADHAM, M.D., Dean.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE  MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS' SOLICITORS' GOWNS

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS ESTABLISHED 1680.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

CAVENDISH COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

An EXAMINATION will be held at the COLLEGE on AUGUST 4, 5, and 6, 1886, for the Award of TWO SCHOLARSHIPS, of the value of £30 each, tenable for three years, offered by the CLOTH-WORKERS' COMPANY and by G. E. FOSTER, Esq. Candidates must be under the age of 17 on August 6, 1886.

The College charges, £24 per annum, cover all expenses for board (including an extra Term in the Long Vacation and washing) and tuition, including University fees.

For further information apply to the WARDEN, Cavendish College, Cambridge.

LAW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED IN THE YEAR 1854.

The only Law Insurance Office in the United Kingdom which transacts both Fire and Life Insurance Business.

Chief Office—216, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C. The Funds in hand and Capital Subscribed amount to upwards of £1,500,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

Deputy-Chairman—CHARLES PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

The Directors invite attention to the New Form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

Policies of Insurance granted against the contingency of Issue at moderate rates of Premium.

The Company ADVANCES Money on Mortgage of Life Interests and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

The Company also purchases Reversions. Prospectuses, copies of the Directors' Report and Annual Balance Sheet, and every information, sent post-free on application to

FRANK MGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

REVERSIONARY and LIFE INTERESTS IN LANDED or FUNDED PROPERTY or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED, or Loans or Annuities thereon granted, by the EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY (LIMITED), 10, Lancaster-place, Waterloo Bridge, Strand. Established 1835. Capital, £500,000. Interest on Loans may be capitalized.

F. S. CLAYTON, } Joint
 C. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries

UNTEARABLE LETTER COPYING BOOKS.

HOWARD'S PATENT.

Stronger and more durable than any other Letter Copying Books now made.

THE COPYING BOOK FOR THE PROFESSION PRICE LIST UPON APPLICATION.

WODDERSPOON & CO.,

7, SERLE STREET, and 1, PORTUGAL STREET LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.

NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY

Established 1836.

LONDON: 1, Moorgate-street, E.C.4. LIVERPOOL: 1, Union-terrace.

INCOME & FUNDS (1884):—

Fire Premiums ..	£573,000
Life Premiums ..	194,000
Interest ..	128,000
Accumulated Funds ..	\$1,993,001

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER'S LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

MESSRS. JOHNSON & DYMOND beg to announce that their Sales by Auction of Plate, Watches, Chains, Jewellery, Precious Stones, &c., are held on Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. The attention of Solicitors, Executors, Trustees, and others is particularly called to this ready means for the disposal of Property of deceased and other clients.

In consequence of the frequency of their sales Messrs. J. & D. are enabled to include large or small quantities at short notice (if required).

Sales of Furniture held at private houses. Valuations for Probate or Transfer. Terms on application to the City Auction Rooms (established 1793), 38 and 39, Gracechurch-street, E.C.

Messrs. Johnson & Dymond beg to notify that their Auction Sales of Wearing Apparel, Piece Goods, Household and Office Furniture, Carpets, Bedding, &c., are held on each day of the week Saturday excepted.

INTEMPERANCE.

COLMAN HILL HOUSE RETREAT, HALESOWEN, WORCESTERSHIRE.

Licensed under the Act of 1879, for Ladies only. Terms from £3 2s. per week. Apply to the Proprietor, Townsend H. use, Halesowen.

Feb 12.
Feb 6.
ntry,
ludes
ume,
arity
o the
asi le

.. 418
a
.. 419
.. 420
.. 420
.. 421
.. 421
.. 422
.. 422
.. 423

ER

ther
ION

EET
NY
1,

001
ON,
of
ding
ting
Rent
y, is
y be
ide
ss.—
han

peg
a of
nes,
ays,
ees,
ans
her
les
nail

ap-
ned
nat
ece
ts,
week

T,